

The  
American Historical Review

THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS IN THE SERMONS OF  
THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

IN the intellectual life of the middle ages the University of Paris occupies a place of preëminent importance. "The Italians have the Papacy, the Germans have the Empire, and the French have Learning", ran the old saying; and the chosen abode of Learning was Paris. The University of Paris was generally recognized as the "parent of the sciences" and the first school of the church<sup>1</sup>, and its supremacy was manifest not only in its position as the center of scholasticism and the bulwark of orthodoxy, but also in the large number and wide distribution of its students, in its influence upon the establishment and the constitutions of other universities, and in its large share in the political and ecclesiastical movements of the later middle ages<sup>2</sup>. So prominent were the constitutional and theological aspects of the university and so violent the controversies which raged about it, that, amid the confusion of chancellors and faculties and nations and the conflicts over the new Aristotle and the "Eternal Gospel", there is some danger of losing sight of the more human

<sup>1</sup> Glorifications of Paris as the great center of learning are common in medieval literature. See for examples the bull *Parens Scientiarum* of Gregory IX. (*Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, I. 136) and the anonymous sermon printed by Hauréau (*Notices et Extraits de Quelques Manuscrits Latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris, 1890-1893, II. 105), where Paris is called the mill where the world's corn is ground and the oven where its bread is baked.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, I. 518 ff.; Valois, *La France et le Grand Schisme*; Gross, "The Political Influence of the University of Paris in the Middle Ages", *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, VI. 440-445. The interesting subject of foreign students at Paris is treated by Budinsky, *Die Universität Paris und die Fremden an derselben im Mittelalter* (Berlin, 1876), but there is room for a more thorough study on the basis of the materials since published in the *Chartularium*. The proportion of foreigners among the distinguished doctors of the university was remarkably high. Cf. Hauréau, *Quelques MSS.*, IV. 47-48.

element and forgetting that an adequate idea of a university can be got only when its teaching and organization are seen against the background of the daily life of its student body. Unfortunately, the sources of information concerning the student life of medieval Paris are by no means abundant. There is of course much to be gleaned from the great *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, so admirably edited by Denifle and Chatelain, and from the proctor's book of the English nation printed as an appendix to it—our knowledge of the various taverns of medieval Paris, for example, being largely derived from this nation's minutes of the drinking up of its surplus revenue<sup>1</sup>; but most of the documents in this invaluable repository relate to the organization and external history of the university rather than to its inner life. The records of the courts of law, so rich a mine of information for student manners at other universities, fail us entirely at Paris<sup>2</sup>, and the collections of student letters, which reflect the decent commonplaces of existence among medieval scholars, are not of much assistance here.<sup>3</sup> For the early years of the university the Goliardic poetry and other products of the Renaissance of the twelfth century are, it is true, of considerable value, but this movement was soon crushed by the triumph of scholasticism, and in the thirteenth century, when Paris was the undisputed intellectual center of Christendom, very little poetry of any sort was produced<sup>4</sup>. But while not an age of poetry, the thirteenth century was an age of preaching, and in the scarcity of other sources the

<sup>1</sup> Sixty such resorts of this nation, which comprised the students from northern and eastern Europe, are mentioned in its records. See Chatelain, "Notes sur Quelques Tavernes Frequentées par l'Université de Paris aux XIV<sup>e</sup> et XV<sup>e</sup> Siècles", in *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris et de l'Île de France*, XXV, 87-109.

<sup>2</sup> For illustrations from Bologna see the documents published in the appendix to Cavazza, *Le Scuole dell' Antico Studio Bolognese* (Milan, 1896), and for Oxford the coroners' inquests published by Rogers, *Oxford City Documents*, 145 ff.; Gross, *Coroners' Rolls*, 87-91; Willard, *The Royal Authority and the Early English Universities* (Philadelphia, 1902), 82-85.

<sup>3</sup> Haskins, "The Life of Medieval Students as Illustrated by their Letters", *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, III, 203-229.

<sup>4</sup> The poems of most interest in relation to the University of Paris in the thirteenth century are those of Rutebeuf (ed. Kressner, Wolfenbüttel, 1885). Jean de Garlande can hardly be called a poet, but the large amount of prose and verse which he turned out contains not a little of interest to the student of university conditions, as I hope to show at some future time. His *Morale Scholarium*, however (Bruges, MS. 546, ff. 2-12; Caius College, MS. 385, pp. 302-316), which promises something of the interest of the German student-manuals of the fifteenth century, proves on examination distinctly disappointing.

For the general history of the University of Paris in the thirteenth century see, besides the *Chartularium* and the general works of Denifle, Kaufmann, and Rashdall, the recent publications of Luchaire, *L'Université de Paris sous Philippe-Auguste* (Paris, 1899); Delègue, *L'Université de Paris 1224-1244* (Paris, 1902); and Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant* (Freiburg, 1899).



enormous mass of sermons which has come down to us from that period is well worthy of examination for the light it throws upon the University of Paris and its life.

The material is at first sight not promising. By their very nature sermons are not historical but hortatory; their purpose is to edify, not to record; and the preaching of the thirteenth century, with its elaborate subdivisions, its piling of text upon text, its senses literal and allegorical, tropological and anagogical, would seem peculiarly barren of information upon the life of its age<sup>1</sup>. In the midst, however, of the scholastic sermonizing of this period, and soon reacting upon it, there came a genuine revival of popular preaching, due largely to the influence of the mendicant orders. In order to hold the attention of the people the preachers found it necessary to be entertaining, as well as simple and direct, and to make abundant use of marvels, anecdotes, and pointed illustrations from every-day life. If his audience showed signs of nodding, the speaker would begin, "There was once a king named Arthur", or shout suddenly, "That fellow who is asleep will not give away my secrets"<sup>2</sup>. Such sallies might easily pass the bounds of reverence and even of decency<sup>3</sup>, and Dante had good ground for complaining of those "who go forth with jests and buffooneries to preach" and swell with pride if they can but raise a laugh<sup>4</sup>.

Questions of propriety apart, however, it is this very freedom and unconventionality on the part of many of the preachers which gives them their historical interest. The stories, or *exempla*, with which the sermons are embellished come from all kinds of sources—fables and folk-lore, bestiaries, lives of saints, historical manuals, and personal experiences—and comprise the greatest variety of legends and miracles and contemporary anecdotes, so that they afford a most valuable insight into the popular religion and superstitions of their day, besides preserving a considerable amount of curious information concerning the manners and customs of all

<sup>1</sup> See the general works of Bourgain, *La Chaire Française au XII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris, 1879), and Lecoy de la Marche, *La Chaire Française au Moyen Âge, spécialement au XIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (second edition, Paris, 1886). There is an excellent résumé of the subject by Langlois, "L'Éloquence Sacrée au Moyen Âge", in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, January 1, 1893, 170-201.

<sup>2</sup> Cesar of Heisterbach, ed. Strange, I. 205; T. F. Crane, *The Exempla of Jacques de Vitry* (London, 1890), xlii, note.

<sup>3</sup> For illustrations see the extracts printed by Hauréau, *Quelques MSS.*, IV. 17 ff.; and the citations in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, XXVI. 417 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Paradiso*, xxix, 115-117. Gautier de Château-Thierry says of the sending of the disciples by John the Baptist to Christ, "Audiebat verba oris eius, non opera regum vel renardi vel fabulas". MS. Lat. 15959, f. 59, col. 4.

classes of society<sup>1</sup>. Still, the great body of medieval sermons is not interesting reading, especially in the condensed and desiccated form in which most of them have come down to us. The *exempla* and the allusions to contemporary life constitute but a small portion of the whole, and it is a long and arduous task to separate these from the mass of scholastic theology and pulpit commonplaces in which they lie embedded. In the case of the *exempla* much of this labor of sifting was performed by the medieval purveyors of sermon-helps, who not only provided the lazy or ignorant preacher with complete series of sermons for the ecclesiastical year under such suggestive titles as *Sermones Parati* or *Dormi Secure*, but also furnished material for enlivening these dry outlines in the form of collections of *exempla* conveniently arranged by subjects—manuals of clerical wit and anecdote which enjoyed great popularity in the later middle ages and have survived in numerous manuscripts and early imprints. The importance of these compilations for the history of medieval culture is now recognized<sup>2</sup>, and a good deal of the more

<sup>1</sup> See the sketches in Bourgain and Lecoy de la Marche entitled "La Société d'après les Sermons".

<sup>2</sup> Upon *exempla* and their use see Crane, "Medieval Sermon-Books and Stories", in the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* (1883), XXI. 49-78; the introduction and notes to his edition of *The Exempla of Jacques de Vitry*; De Vooys, *Middel-nederlandsche Legenden en Exempelen* (The Hague, 1900); and various recent papers of Schönbach in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy. Translations of typical stories of this sort have been made into English by Munro, *Monastic Tales of the XIII. Century*, in the "Translations and Reprints" published by the University of Pennsylvania, II., No. 4; and into French by Lecoy de la Marche, *L'Esprit de Nos Aïeux* (Paris, 1888). The most important collections from northern France and the adjacent portions of the empire in the thirteenth century are as follows, Jacques de Vitry and Étienne de Bourbon being, as former students at Paris, the most valuable for university life:

Jacques de Vitry, *Exempla*, edited by Crane for the Folk-Lore Society (1890); also in Pitra, *Analecta Novissima Spicilegii Solesmensis* (Rome, 1888), II. 443-461. Extracts from his *Sermones Vulgares* are also published by Pitra, II. 344-442; the library of Harvard University possesses a manuscript of these sermons which was once the property of the monastery of St. Jacques at Liège (MS. Riant 35).

Cesar of Heisterbach, *Dialogus Miraculorum*, ed. Strange, Cologne, 1851; fragments of the *Libri VIII Miraculorum*, ed. Meister, Rome, 1901; stories from the *Homelie*, ed. Schönbach, Vienna *Sitzungsberichte*, phil.-hist. Kl., CXLIV., No. 9 (cf. also his review of Meister, *Mittheilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, XXIII. 660 ff.).

Thomas de Cantimpré, *Bonum Universale de Apibus*. Various editions; see Van Der Vet, *Het Biënboec van Thomas van Cantimpré en zijn Exempelen* (The Hague, 1902). Étienne de Bourbon, *Anecdotes Historiques*, ed. Lecoy de la Marche (Paris, 1877).

Anonymous *Compilatio Singularis Exemplorum*, MS. 468 of the Bibliothèque de Tours. A valuable collection which deserves further study. Cf. Delisle in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XXIX. 598 ff. There are some extracts in the Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. Baluze 77, ff. 169 ff.

Anonymous *Tractatus Exemplorum secundum Ordinem Alphabeti*, described by Delisle in *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, XXXI. 57-62. I have used the copy at Auxerre (MS. 35).

scattered material has been rendered available by the patient scholarship of the late Barthélémy Haureau, whose studies must form the starting-point of any other investigations in this field<sup>1</sup>.

In endeavoring to bring together such information as the sermons contain upon the life of the University of Paris in the thirteenth century we must give up from the first any idea of an exhaustive investigation. Of all countries France was the most productive in sermons, and probably most of the distinguished French preachers of this period were at some time in their careers connected with the University of Paris; and while few of their sermons have been, or ever will be, published, the number preserved in manuscript reaches far into the thousands. Some practical limit must evidently be set by confining the study to the printed texts and to such portions of the manuscript sources as seem likely to yield fruitful results. Accordingly, besides the collections of *exempla* and the extensive materials published or indicated by Haureau<sup>2</sup>, attention has been directed especially to those preachers who had personal knowledge of academic conditions at Paris and were in the habit of alluding to them in their sermons, particularly to that altogether delightful cleric, Robert de Sorbon<sup>3</sup>, the companion of St. Louis and founder of the Sorbonne, and to the chancellors of the

Reference should also be made to the *Latin Stories* edited by Wright for the Percy Society (1842), and to the fables of Odo of Cheriton in the edition of Hervieux, *Fabulistes Latins*, IV. (1896). There is a collection of *exempla* in Munich (Cod. Lat. 23420) which would repay study.

<sup>1</sup> See particularly his *Notices et Extraits de Quelques Manuscrits Latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (cited below simply as Haureau); and numerous articles in the *Histoire Littéraire* and the *Journal des Savants*. The catalogue of *Incipits* of sermons and other Latin works of the middle ages upon which Haureau based many of his conclusions as to authorship is now in the hands of the Académie des Inscriptions.

<sup>2</sup> Haureau's studies were chiefly confined to manuscripts in Paris. Besides the various manuscripts in other libraries noted below under individual preachers, I have found of special interest the following miscellaneous collections of Paris sermons: Bodleian, Ashmolean MS. 757; Merton College, MS. 237; Munich, Cod. Lat. 23372; Library of St. Mark's at Venice, Fondo Antico, MS. 92.

<sup>3</sup> See Haureau, "Les Propos de Maître Robert de Sorbon", in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, XXXI. 2. 133-149; and the bibliography and list of Robert's works in the introduction to Chambon's edition of the *De Conscientia* (Paris, 1903). The library of the Sorbonne formerly possessed "Sermones magistri Roberti de Sorbona de tempore, de festis, et ad status" (Delisle, *Cabinet des Manuscrits*, III. 113), but the manuscript seems to have disappeared. The most considerable collection of his sermons which survives is found in the Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. Lat. 15971, ff. 68-198, a collection for Sundays and holy days throughout the year, delivered, as appears from the concordance of the fixed and movable feasts, in 1260 and 1261. A large number of these sermons are in his name and many of the others are in his style. Scattered sermons are in MSS. Lat. 14952, f. 53 (printed by Haureau, *Quelques MSS.*, IV. 69); 15951, f. 374; 15952, ff. 14, 119, 119v; 15954, ff. 172, 272; 15955, f. 179; 16482, ff. 309-312, 318; 16488, ff. 437v, 457v; 16499, f. 272; 16505, ff. 155v, 157, 217, 220v; 16507, ff. 30, 267, 268, 421; and in Munich, Cod. Lat. 23372, p. 124.

university. Originally simply the official of the church of Notre-Dame who was charged with keeping the chapter's seal and drawing up its documents<sup>1</sup>, the chancellor was early given supervision

<sup>1</sup> On the early functions of the chancellor, see Guérard, *Cartulaire de Notre-Dame de Paris*, I. civ-cv; Mortet, "Maurice de Sully", in the *Mémoires de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris*, XVI. 150 ff. On the later development of the office, see the *Chartularium*, I. xi-xix; Rashdall, *Universities*, I. 305-313, 333-334, 339-342, 393-396, 448-452, 456-458, 472-474.

The chancellors of the thirteenth century are enumerated, with their approximate dates, in the *Chartularium*, I. xix, note, II. xv. The following list of their sermons includes all that I have been able to find after a somewhat protracted search. Unless otherwise indicated, the manuscripts are those of the Bibliothèque Nationale:

Pierre de Poitiers, chancellor as early as 1193 and as late as 1204. See Bourgain, *Chaire Française*, 54; and Hauréau, II. 240, III. 67 ff. The only important collection of his sermons to which attention has been called is in MS. Lat. 14593, where several numbers of the series are repeated. Some of these are also in MSS. Lat. 3563, f. 114; 3705, f. 129; 12293, ff. 99-107; 13586, p. 330; Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS. 1005.

Prévostin (Prepositinus) of Cremona, chancellor from 1206 to 1209 or thereabouts. On his life and works see Hauréau in the *Mélanges Julien Havet*, 297-303, where a list of the Paris manuscripts of his sermons is given. "Sermones Prepositini" are also preserved at Munich, Cod. Lat. 14126, ff. 1-5; in the British Museum, Add. MS. 18335, ff. 2v-25v; and in the Stadtbibliothek at Treves, MS. 222, ff. 21 ff.; but they contain exceedingly little on the life of the time. It may be noted in passing that the above-mentioned manuscript of the British Museum also contains (f. 26) the liturgical treatise seen by Pez at Salzburg, the authorship of which appeared doubtful to Hauréau ("Incipit tractatus de divino officio magistri Prepositini per circulum anni. Ecce nunc tempus acceptionis . . .").

Étienne de Reims, chancellor from 1214 or 1215 to 1218. Only one of his sermons is known, MS. Lat. 16505, f. 190.

Philippe de Grève, 1218-1236, the most distinguished chancellor of this period, often called simply "The Chancellor". His poems and theological writings do not concern us here; on the man and his sermons see Oudin, *Commentarius de Scriptoribus Ecclesie*, III. 121; Peiper, in the *Archiv für Literaturgeschichte*, VII. 409 ff.; the index to the first volume of the *Chartularium*; and especially Hauréau in the *Journal des Savants*, July, 1894. His sermons fall into four groups:

1. *Sermones festuales*, for Sundays and holy days throughout the year. MSS. Lat. 2516A, 3280, 3543, 3544, 3545, 12416, 15933, 16469 (last portion of series only); Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS. 1009; MSS. Troyes 1417; Rouen 615; Alençon 153; Bourges 117; British Museum, Royal MS. 8. F. 13; Siena, MS. F. x. 5. According to Omont (*Cabinet Historique*, 1882, p. 568), this series is also found in the seminary library at Autun, MS. 139 B. Scattered sermons of this series are in MSS. Lat. 15951, 15954, 15955, 15959, 16466, 16471, 16488, 16505, 16507; MSS. Amiens 284; Bourges 115, ff. 74-84; Arras 329, f. 54.

2. *Expositiones Evangeliorum Dominicorum*, also called simply *Omélies*, really a theological commentary on the Gospels throughout the year (cf. Hauréau, VI. 56). MSS. Lat. 3281, 18175; Vatican, Fondo Vaticano, MSS. 1246, 1247; Lincoln Cathedral, MS. A. 2. 5; Cambridge, Peterhouse, MS. 1. 3. 9; Munich, Cod. Lat. 3740; Erfurt, MS. Q. 97; Troyes 1100, ff. 206-227v.

3. *In Psalterium Davidicum CCCXXX Sermones*. Numerous manuscripts; published at Paris in 1522 and at Brescia in 1600.

4. A number of occasional sermons delivered at Paris and various places in northern France and possessing considerable historical interest. Two are in MS. Lat. n. a. 338 (ff. 152, 236), where they were seen and their importance noted by Hauréau (*Journal des Savants*, August, 1889; *Quelques MSS.*, VI. 239). The others, unknown to Hauréau, are found in MSS. Avranches 132; Troyes 1099; and Vitry-le-François 69. The

over the schools which sprang up about the cathedral, and as these grew in numbers and importance and developed into a university he still asserted his right to license masters and his jurisdiction over scholars. Stubborn conflicts arose over these claims in the earlier years of the thirteenth century, and various papal bulls placed important restrictions upon the chancellor's powers, but he continued

Avranches manuscript is the most complete collection of Philip's sermons, containing also the first and second series.

There is no apparent reason for attributing to Philip the *Sermones cancellarii Parisiensis* of MS. 403 of the Royal Library at Berlin (cf. Rose, *Verzeichnis*, II. 237) or the *Sermones . . . cancellarii Parisiensis* at Erfurt (MS. F. 103). For an old French sermon on the Virgin composed in part by him see Valois, *Guillaume d'Auvergne*, 220 ff.

Guiard de Laon, chancellor from 1237 to 1238, when he became bishop of Cambrai. On his writings see the *Histoire Littéraire*, XVIII. 354-356; and Hauréau, in the *Journal des Savants*, June, 1893. His numerous sermons, many of which are shown by the manuscripts to have been preached at Paris, have not come down to us in any single collection (the *Summula Sermonum* seen by Oudin at Dijon seems to have been lost) but are found in several manuscripts, scattered among those of Eudes de Châteauroux, Guillaume d'Auvergne, and others of his contemporaries. Taken together, MSS. Lat. 15959, 15955, and 15964 offer a fairly complete series for Sundays and festivals throughout the year, often with several for the same day. MSS. Lat. 15951 and 16471 and MS. Arras 329 contain a large number of sermons *de sanctis*. Various sermons are in MSS. Lat. 12418 (five, not three, as Hauréau states), 15952, 15953, 15954, 16488, 16502, 16505, 16507, n. a. 338, and in MS. Amiens 284 (which contains some in addition to those enumerated in Coyecque's catalogue). An old French sermon of Guiard is printed in the *Revue des Sciences Ecclésiastiques* (1861), IV. 124. Some of his sermons in MS. Lat. 16471 were ascribed by Hauréau to Gautier de Château-Thierry because of the opinion, which he was finally compelled to abandon, that Guiard was never chancellor.

Eudes de Châteauroux, chancellor 1238-1244 and afterward cardinal bishop of Tusculum. The time at my disposal has not permitted an investigation of the very numerous manuscripts of Eudes, apparently the most prolific sermonizer of all the chancellors of his century. Cardinal Pitra (*Analecta Novissima Spicilegii Solesmensis*, II. 188-343) has published extracts from a collection of 765 of his sermons in the possession of the Dominicans at Rome and has enumerated a large number of other manuscripts; many of the Paris manuscripts have been noted by Hauréau. See also Delisle in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XLIX. 268-272. The printed sermons and such others as I have read bear out Hauréau's statement that they contain few allusions to the customs or events of the time. On Eudes see Pitra, II. xxiii-xxv; Hauréau, in the *Journal des Savants*, August, 1888, and in the *Notices et Extraits des MSS.*, XXIV. 2. 204 ff.

Gautier de Château-Thierry, chancellor from 1246 to 1249, when he became bishop of Paris. Scattered sermons by him are found in MSS. Lat. 15951, 15953, 15955, 15959, 16471, 16488, 16507; MS. Arras 329, ff. 1, 53v, 72, 152; and MS. Arras 691, f. 139v. In a volume of *Questiones Theologicae* in the Bibliotheca Antoniana at Padua (MS. 152) his name appears on ff. 150v and 153; on f. 152v, apropos of the question whether a master reading at Paris can preach without the bishop's license, he has something to say of the chancellor's office. Some account of Gautier and his writings will be found in *Gallia Christiana*, VII. 100; *Histoire Littéraire*, XXVI. 390-395; Lecoy de la Marche, *Chaire Française*, 95.

Étienne Tempier, also known as Étienne d'Orléans, chancellor from 1262 or 1263 to 1268, when he became bishop of Paris. See *Gallia Christiana*, VII. 108-115; Hauréau, in *Journal des Savants*, 1890, p. 255. Three sermons by him are in MS. Lat. 16481, ff. 77v, 136v, 214 (cf. Quétif and Échard, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, I. 269).

to style himself the head of the university and to direct the examinations leading to the master's degree. As the chancellors were themselves masters and generally distinguished preachers as well, it is evident that their sermons, though they are naturally of the learned and dignified type and need to be used with due allowance for the official and often unfriendly attitude of the authors, represent close acquaintance with university affairs and possess special importance for the purpose of our study.

With regard to the studies pursued at Paris we must not expect to find much information in the sermons. Various chancellors do indeed draw out elaborate comparisons between the seven liberal arts and the seven gifts of the spirit<sup>1</sup>, between the lessons of the Lord's school and those of the devil's<sup>2</sup>, but in such cases the audience is assumed to be sufficiently familiar with the studies mentioned, and the weight of exposition is put upon the corresponding virtue or vice; and even where the account is more specific, it offers interest as an expression of the preacher's attitude toward learning rather than as a description of particular subjects. The all-important study, according to the preachers, is of course theology, "Madame

Jean d'Orléans, also known as Jean des Alleux, chancellor from 1271 to 1280, when he became a Dominican. See *Chartularium*, I. 494; Quétif and Échard, I. 499; *Histoire Littéraire*, XXV. 270-280. His sermons are scattered through MSS. Lat. 14899, ff. 46, 83, 86, 132; 14947 (see Quétif and Échard, I. 385); 14952, f. 188v; 15005 (contained also in MS. 14947); 15956, ff. 279v, 301v, 313v; 16481 (see Quétif and Échard, I. 268); 16482, ff. 178v, 204, 275v (ascribed to him by Quétif and Échard and the *Histoire Littéraire*); MS. Soissons 125, f. 60 (Molinier's catalogue is wrong in attributing to him the four that follow, of which two are anonymous and two in the name "fratris Petri de Remerico Monte"); MS. Troyes 1788, f. 82v; Munich, Cod. Lat. 23372, pp. 8, 15, 19, 29, 39, 47, 53, 88, 129, 130; Bodleian, Ashmolean MS. 757, ff. 81, 349, 359; Merton College, MS. 237, ff. 32v, 94v, 110; Venice, Library of St. Mark's, Fondo Antico, MS. 92, ff. 228 ff. (six sermons).

Nicolas de Nonancourt, 1284-1288. Sermons in MSS. Lat. 15952, ff. 277v (also in 14961, f. 135), 279; 16252, f. 279. A "sermo cancellarii" in MS. Lat. 15952, f. 113 (and anonymously in MS. 14899, f. 109) is attributed to him by Hauréau.

Bertaud de St. Denis, 1288-1295. But one of his sermons is known: MS. Lat. 14947, f. 210 (also in MSS. Lat. 15005, f. 113, and 15129, f. 191). Cf. *Histoire Littéraire*, XXV. 317-320, XXVI. 439; *Journal des Savants*, 1889, p. 303, 1891, p. 302.

Sermons of anonymous chancellors who have not been identified are in MSS. Lat. 568, f. 190; 10968, f. 104; 12418, ff. 109, 110; 15527, f. 1; 15952, ff. 107-108; 16502, ff. 26, 84v, 124. The editors of the *Chartularium* declare that various sermons of Aimery de Veire, chancellor from 1249 to circa 1263, are extant, but none were known to Hauréau nor have I been able to discover any. The sermons in MS. Lat. 2516A, of which Lecoy de la Marche conjectures Aimery to have been the author, are the work of Philippe de Grève (*Journal des Savants*, 1890, p. 249).

<sup>1</sup>Prévostin, British Museum, Add. MS. 18335, f. 14; Gautier de Château-Thierry, MS. Lat. 15955, f. 429; and MS. Arras 329, f. 3v; Eudes de Châteauroux, MS. Lat. 15959, f. 240v; Barthélémy de Tours, Hauréau, IV. 35. Cf. Philippe de Grève, in *Psalterium*, I. f. 311 (Paris, 1522); Jacques de Vitry, in Pitra, II. 365.

<sup>2</sup>Jean d'Orléans, Munich, Cod. Lat. 23372, p. 39.



la Haute Science" of the thirteenth century<sup>1</sup>, supreme above all other studies, which may be valuable as discipline but do not deserve to be studied for their own sakes<sup>2</sup>. The arts are merely preparatory to theology<sup>3</sup>; indeed the *trivium* affords a sufficient preparation, since "the branches of the *quadrivium*, though containing truth, do not lead to piety"<sup>4</sup>. "The sword of God's word is forged by grammar, sharpened by logic, and burnished by rhetoric, but only theology can use it." Some students, however, use up the blade in putting on the edge<sup>5</sup>; others give the best years of their life to fine speaking<sup>6</sup> or to the study of the stars<sup>7</sup>, coming in their old age to theology, which should be the wife of their youth<sup>8</sup>. Some neglect theology for geometry<sup>9</sup> or for the works of the philosophers<sup>10</sup>, so that even when they reach theology, they cannot be separated from their Aristotle<sup>11</sup>, but read his forbidden books in secret<sup>12</sup> and corrupt their faith<sup>13</sup>. The chief menace, however, to the preëminence of theology seems to have been the study of the canon law, after 1219

<sup>1</sup> Henri d'Andeli, *La Bataille des Sept Arts*, line 79 (ed. Héron, 46).

<sup>2</sup> "Exercitandus et exercendus est animus in aliis scienciis, et in logicis et in naturalibus et in moralibus, secundum uniuscuiusque possibilitatem. Ipsa etiam scientia iuris, maxime iuris canonici, non parum neccessaria sacre scripture doctoribus. Licet autem predicta discantur ante ipsam, finaliter tamen addiscenda sunt propter ipsam". Philippe de Grève (?), "ad scolares", MS. Troyes 1099, f. 38.

<sup>3</sup> See the passages from sermons cited by Denifle, *Universitäten*, I. 100.

<sup>4</sup> Jacques de Vitry, in Pitra, *Analecta Novissima*, II. 368, and Lecoy de la Marche, *Chaire Française*, 458, note.

<sup>5</sup> "Gramatica fabricat gladium verbi Dei, logica ipsum acuit, rethorica ipsum polit, et theologia ipso utitur et ipso percussit; sed quidam scolares superintendunt fabricationi, id est gramatice, alii acutioni in tantum ipsum acuendo quod totam aciem auferunt ei". Robert de Sorbon (?), MS. Lat. 15971, f. 198.

<sup>6</sup> Gautier de Château-Thierry, MS. Lat. 15959, f. 437, col. 1.

<sup>7</sup> "Est alia quorundam sapientia qui scire complexiones argumentationum, deceptiones sophismatum, secreta celi rimantur, motus astrorum, cursus planetarum. In his tamen non adeo reprehensibiles invenio sacerdotes sed quosdam qui etatem suam in his consumunt, quorum ingenium in talibus desudant; semper discunt et nunquam ad scientiam veritatis proveniunt". Pierre de Poitiers, MSS. Lat. 12293, f. 101v; 14593, f. 146v, 320v.

<sup>8</sup> Philippe de Grève, in *Journal des Savants*, 1894, p. 430.

<sup>9</sup> "Multi proponunt librum geometrie libro theologie". Guiard de Laon, MS. Lat. 16471, f. 221.

<sup>10</sup> "Tercia sollicitudo mala est nimie curiositatis studendo in libris philosophorum et pretermittendo theologiam". Jean d'Orléans, MS. Lat. 14889, f. 84v. For the different view of an eminent philosopher, Jean de La Rochelle, see Hauréau, *Histoire de la Philosophie Scholastique*, part 2, I. 194.

<sup>11</sup> Jean de St. Gilles, in Hauréau, VI. 234.

<sup>12</sup> Guiard de Laon, in *Journal des Savants*, 1893, p. 370.

<sup>13</sup> Jacques de Vitry, in Hauréau, *Philosophie Scholastique*, part 2, I. 108, note.

On the standard authorities in the various subjects at Paris cf. the following passage from a sermon of Friar Bartholomew of Bologna: "Aristotili creditur in logica, Galieno in medicina, et Tullio in rethorica, et similiter de aliis; et esset opprobrium alicui quod in grammatica aliquid diceret contra precepta Prisciani et in logica contra precepta Aristotilis et sic de aliis scientiis". Bodleian, Ashmolean MS. 757, ff. 367, 403v.



the only branch of jurisprudence represented at Paris. The rapid development of the judicial and administrative side of the ecclesiastical system in this period created a considerable demand for men trained in law, and many are the denunciations uttered by the theologians against those who forsake the water of sacred scripture for the Abana and Pharpar of the decretists<sup>1</sup> and are advanced to the best places in the church through the seductions of their devil's rhetoric<sup>2</sup>.

The utilitarian motive appears not only in such obviously "lucrative" studies as law and medicine<sup>3</sup>, but likewise in theology and arts, the study of which was the natural road to ecclesiastical preferment. The chief hope of many students lay in securing a good benefice or prebend<sup>4</sup>, to which end they would toil early and late, since a prebend of a hundred livres might depend upon remembering a single word at the examination<sup>5</sup>. Favoritism also played its part in the distribution of patronage, and great was the popularity of those masters who had the ear of bishops or could exert other influence on behalf of their scholars<sup>6</sup>. Many who had the good

<sup>1</sup> Philippe de Grève (?), MS. Troyes 1099, f. 37.

<sup>2</sup> "Leges . . . multi audiunt ut volare possint ad dignitates". Jean de Blois, MS. Lat. n. a. 338, f. 110v. Hauréau, VI. 226, 228; *Histoire Littéraire*, XXVI. 394; *Journal des Savants*, 1893, p. 368. Cf. Dante, *Paradiso*, ix. 133 ff., xii. 82-83; Caesar of Heisterbach, in Vienna *Sitzungsberichte*, phil.-hist. Kl., CXLIV. 9. 79. Robert de Sorbon tells the story of a woman who supposed that her son was studying theology at Paris when he was really studying canon law, and who burst into tears on his return, saying, "Credebam quod filius meus deberet esse in servicio Dei et deberet ire ad scientiam Dei et quod esse deberet unus magnus predicator, et ei vix a cordalis (volebat dicere ad decretales)". MS. Lat. 15971, f. 167.

On the general feeling toward lawyers in this period cf. Étienne de Bourbon, Nos. 438 ff.; the poem of Philippe de Grève *De Advocatis*, published in the *Archives des Missions* (1866), second series, III. 288; and the following passage from a collection of Paris sermons in the Library of St. Mark's (Fondo Antico 92, f. 193): "Quondam ecclesia consuevit regi in pace per canones, modo regitur per advocatos, per quos fiunt plura mala quam per hereticos; et student in legibus dicentes quod canones non possunt scribi sine legibus".

<sup>3</sup> "Omnes avaricie student, quia intermediis scienciis intendunt que sunt lucrative, scilicet medici, legiste, decretiste". Robert de Sorbon (?), MS. Lat. 15971, f. 198. On "lucrative sciences", cf. the bull *Super speculam* of Honorius III., *Chartularium*, I., No. 32.

<sup>4</sup> See the debate between the poor and the rich student published by Hauréau, VI. 306. Cf. also the forms of solicitation for benefices preserved in the student letter-writers. *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, III. 209, note 3.

<sup>5</sup> Robert de Sorbon, in Hauréau, IV. 70. Cf. IV. 38; *Histoire Littéraire*, XXVI. 436. So Albert de Reims: "Sic laborat aliquis .xx. annis in studio, et quis est finis eius? Certe ut capiat muscam, id est prebendam". St. Mark's, Fondo Antico 92, f. 261v.

<sup>6</sup> "Scolares [curiositatem habent] de magistris qui habent favorem prelatorum". Guiard de Laon, MS. Amiens 284, f. 5v. So Robert de Sorbon, *De Conscientia*, 26; anon. in MS. Lat. 16471, f. 118; MS. Arras 329, f. 86.

fortune to get benefices remained at Paris to enjoy them<sup>1</sup>, a form of non-residence which seems to have become a serious abuse by the thirteenth century, so that some students even held more than one benefice at the same time<sup>2</sup>. Indeed a parish or cathedral appointment might come at the beginning as well as at the end of one's university career, being sometimes conferred upon ignorant youths, who at once hastened to Paris to secure some sort of an education—"like a physician who should take his pay, leave his patient, and come to the university to learn his medicine", says one preacher<sup>3</sup>.

Too eager pursuit of learning for its own sake was in quite as much disfavor with the preachers as were ambition and non-residence. Scholars are constantly warned against the vanity of much study and against the sins of pride or false doctrine which may arise from wandering beyond the limits of modest attainment.<sup>4</sup> "Clerks busy themselves with eclipses of the sun, but fail to observe the darkening of their own hearts by sin"<sup>5</sup>. Far better is it that they should seek to know themselves than to search out the nature of animals, the virtues of herbs, or the courses of the stars<sup>6</sup>. The doves know well the golden rule, yet they have never studied at Paris or heard lectures on the *Topica*<sup>7</sup>. This doctrine is enforced by stories of masters struck dumb to punish their conceit<sup>8</sup>, and of ambitious scholars dead before their time, after they had studied so hard in the hope of becoming bishop that they would never go out into the fields with

<sup>1</sup> Hauréau, VI. 209, 210, 213, 214, 230, 233, 237; Guiard de Laon, MS. Lat. 15959, f. 14; Jean de Blois, MS. Lat. n. a. 338, f. 111.

<sup>2</sup> *Journal des Savants*, 1893, p. 368, 1894, p. 436.

<sup>3</sup> "Contra illos qui tunc primo incipiunt studere et addiscere [MS. addicere] cum habent curam animarum, similes medico qui recepto salario dimisso infirmo vadit ad studium addiscere medicinam." MS. Lat. 15971, f. 198. Cf. Hauréau, III. 243, VI. 58. An example of this abuse from the early part of the twelfth century is given in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, IX. 610. In 1254 two canons of Mainz, who were banished from Germany for stealing, were permitted to receive revenue from their prebends if they would study at Paris. Böhmer-Will, *Regesta Archiepiscoporum Moguntiensium*, II. 322, No. 78.

<sup>4</sup> Jacques de Vitry, in Pitra, *Analecta Novissima*, I. 362; Guiard de Laon, MS. Lat. 16488, f. 377v; Prévostin, in *Mélanges Julien Havet*, 302.

<sup>5</sup> "Querunt clerici de eclipsi solis sed de eclipsi solis spiritualis que contingit in cordibus eorum per peccatum non querunt." Robert de Sorbon, MS. Lat. 15971, f. 167. He alludes to the study of the stars and the movements of the heavens in the same MS., ff. 171v, 195. So Gautier de Château-Thierry, MS. Lat. 15955, f. 429; MS. Lat. 16488, f. 410.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*, MS. Lat. 15951, f. 185; MS. Lat. 16488, f. 399.

<sup>7</sup> "Hanc regulam bene sciunt columbe que nunquam studuerunt Parisius nec audiverunt Topica." *Id.*, MS. Lat. 16471, f. 79; MS. Lat. 16507, f. 39.

<sup>8</sup> *Histoire Littéraire*, XXXI. 54; Robert de Sorbon, MS. Lat. 15971, f. 198, translated in Lecoy de la Marche, *L'Esprit de nos Aïeux*, 279. Robert tells as the counterpart of this story the instance of a successful master whose only preparation for lectures consisted in going to mass every morning.

their companions<sup>1</sup>, or had put off entering monastic life till they should have completed a full course at Paris, Montpellier, and Bologna<sup>2</sup>. The most popular story of this sort was that of a Paris student who appeared after death to his master, clad in a cope of parchment covered with fine writing. In reply to the master's question he said that the writing consisted of the sophisms and vain inquiries upon which he had spent his time, and that the cope was a heavier load to carry than the tower of St. Germain-des-Prés, near which he and the master stood. As proof of the inward fire which tormented him he let fall a drop of perspiration which pierced the master's hand like an arrow and left a permanent opening in it; whereupon the master abandoned the vain croakings and cawings of the schools and joined the Cistercians<sup>3</sup>.

Nothing in these Paris sermons is more interesting than the insight they afford into a phase of the university's life concerning which we have otherwise but little information, namely the nature of the examinations and the preparation for them. On this point evidence is found mainly in the sermons of Robert de Sorbon, and particularly in his treatise *On Conscience*<sup>4</sup>, which is really an expanded sermon based upon an elaborate and suggestive parallel between the examination for the master's degree and the last judgment. Taking as his text Job's desire that his "adversary had written a book"<sup>5</sup>, and outlining his headings in the approved fashion of his time, Robert begins with the statement that if any one decides

<sup>1</sup> Hauréau, IV. 37.

<sup>2</sup> "Clericus quidam Parisius scholaris cum quodam socio suo in una domo et camera manens inspiratus a Deo deliberavit intrare religionem et socium suum ad hoc inducere. Quod renuens socius ait se velle adhuc esse Parisius per triennium et fieri magister, iterum morari apud Montem Pessulanum et fieri magister in medicina, iterum morari Bononie per septennium et fieri dominus legum. Summo mane surgens alius et veniens ad lectum ut acciperet licenciam ab eo invenit eum morte subitanea percussum qui disposuerat vivere tantum." MS. Tours 468, f. 78; MS. Baluze 77, f. 175.

<sup>3</sup> Jacques de Vitry, ed. Crane, 12. On the wide-spread popularity of this *exemplum* see Crane's note (p. 146) and Hauréau, "Les Récits d'Apparitions dans les Sermons du Moyen-Âge", in *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, XXVIII. 2. 239 ff. It has recently been shown that the original of this story was a master at Oxford, Serlon of Wilton, and that the vision antedates 1154. See Schwob in *Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 1898, p. 508.

There is also a curious story of a stupid student who is made miraculously clever by Satan. After his early death devils take his soul to a deep valley and torment it by playing ball with it, but he returns to life and becomes a holy abbot. Cæsar of Heisterbach, ed. Strange, I. 36.

<sup>4</sup> Robert de Sorbon, *De Conscientia et De Tribus Dietis*, ed. Chambon (Paris, 1903). The old editions of Marguerin de la Bigne (*Maxima Bibliotheca Patrum*, XXV. 346-352) and Du Boulay (*Historia Universitatis Parisiensis*, III. 225-235) are very faulty.

<sup>5</sup> Job, xxxi. 35, where the rendering of the Vulgate naturally suggests Robert's treatment: "Librum scribat mihi ipse qui iudicat."

to seek the *licentia legendi* at Paris and cannot be excused from examination—as many of the great, by special favor, are—he would much like to be told by the chancellor, or by some one in his confidence, on what book he would be examined. Just as he would be a crazy student indeed, who, having found out which book this was, should neglect it and spend his time on others, even so is he mad who fails to study the book of his own conscience, in which we shall all, without exception, be examined at the great day. Moreover, if any one is rejected by the chancellor, he may be reexamined after a year, or it may be that, through the intercession of friends or by suitable gifts or services to the chancellor's relatives or other examiners, the chancellor can be induced to change his decision; whereas at the last judgment the sentence will be final and there will be no help from wealth or influence or stout assertion of ability as canonist or civilian or of familiarity with all arguments and all fallacies. Then, if one fails before the chancellor of Paris, the fact is known to but five or six and the mortification passes away in time, while the Great Chancellor, God, will refute the sinner "in full university" before the whole world. The chancellor, too, does not flog the candidate, but in the last judgment the guilty will be beaten with a rod of iron from the valley of Jehosaphat through the length of hell, nor can we reckon, like idle boys in the grammar-schools, on escaping Saturday's punishment by feigning illness, playing truant, or being stronger than the master, or like them solace ourselves with the thought that after all our fun is well worth a whipping. The chancellor's examination, too, is voluntary; he does not force any one to seek the degree, but waits as long as the scholars wish, and is even burdened with their insistent demands for examinations. In studying the book of our conscience we should imitate the candidates for the license, who eat and drink sparingly, conning steadily the one book they are preparing, searching out all the authorities that pertain to this, and hearing only the professors that lecture on this subject, so that they have difficulty in concealing from their fellows the fact that they are preparing for examination. Such preparation is not the work of five or ten days—though there are many who will not meditate a day or an hour on their sins—but of many years.<sup>1</sup> At the examination the chancellor asks, "Brother, what do you say to

<sup>1</sup> "Putatis vos quod si unus homo fuerit per .x. vel per .v. dies ad unam scientiam, quod cancellarius tam cito det licentiam? Certe non, immo oportet quod clerici multis diebus et noctibus et multis annis studeant. Sed multi sunt qui vix volunt una die vel una hora de suis peccatis cogitare." MS. Lat. 16481, f. 154; sermon of Amand de St. Quentin preached at the Madeleine on the fourth Sunday in Lent, 1273. Cf. *Histoire Littéraire*, XXVI. 455.

this question, what do you say to this one and this one?"<sup>1</sup> The chancellor is not satisfied with a verbal knowledge of books without an understanding of their sense,<sup>2</sup> but unlike the Great Judge, who will hear the book of our conscience from beginning to end and suffer no mistakes, he requires only seven or eight passages in a book and passes the candidate if he answers three questions out of four. Still another difference lies in the fact that the chancellor does not always conduct the examination in person, so that the student who would be terrified in the presence of so much learning often answers well before the masters who act in the chancellor's place<sup>3</sup>.

If those who have studied their consciences thoroughly will have such difficulty in the great examination, how much worse will it be for those who have not studied at all? The moralist is thus led to consider where the book of conscience may be read, namely in confession, and to compare the necessity of frequent confession with the student's need of regular attendance upon his master's lectures. At Paris only he who goes to the schools at least twice a week and hears "ordinary" lectures is considered a student, and only such can expect a master to demand their release if captured by the *prévôt* and imprisoned in the Châtelet<sup>4</sup>, yet many there are who confess but once a year or at best make only a hurried confession (*cursorie*); these are not God's scholars and for them there will be no release from the *prévôt* of hell. As at Paris the best clerk is he who by diligent attendance upon lectures becomes able to answer questions which silence the great teachers, so on the day of judgment some simple monk or *béguine* who has well pondered the book of conscience and frequently confessed will put to shame and derision great masters of arts or law or medicine or theology who have neglected these duties. What will it profit a man then to possess the learning of Aristotle and Priscian, of Justinian and Gratian, of Galen and Hippocrates and the rest, preserved on the skins of sheep or goats? If a master were to give his scholars new robes or assure them good prebends in

<sup>1</sup> "Scitis qualiter probantur clerici Parisius? Queritur ab eo, Frater, qualiter diceretis ad istam questionem, et qualiter diceretis tu ad hoc et ad hoc; et secundum hoc quod respondet licenciatur vel refutatur." Amand de S. Quentin, *ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> "Item si quis sciret literam librorum corditenus et nesciret sensum, non transiret examinationem cancellarii." Robert de Sorbon, MS. Lat. 16482, f. 309v. Another allusion of Robert to the chancellor's examination is printed in Lecoy de la Marche, *La Chaire Française*, 457, note.

<sup>3</sup> Robert here cites the instance of an abbot-elect examined before Guiard de Laon, bishop of Cambrai, who was so overcome that he could not even read his missal or say his *Pater noster*.

<sup>4</sup> On the distinction between "ordinary" and "cursory" lectures at Paris see Rashdall, I. 426 ff.; and on the method of securing release from the Châtelet, the *Chartularium*, I., No. 197.

a cathedral, he would have such a throng of scholars that no room could hold them, and other masters, however excellent, would be obliged to shut up shop—"put their fiddles under the bench"—for lack of hearers. Yet God gives to all his followers the garment of the new man and the prebend of his grace the day they enter his school, and, unlike certain proud masters who will lecture only to a large audience, he is willing to read to a single scholar. Many choose as confessors those who have been guilty of the same sin, yet only a fool would study his book with the poorest teacher of Paris, it being one of the glories of a student at his inception that he has studied under the best masters in the city. None but unworthy masters would imitate the jealousy of certain confessors who are unwilling to have their parishioners confess to others; indeed a good master will advise his pupils to attend the lectures of others, for it is scarcely possible to become a good clerk unless one has listened to several masters. Yet men should not avoid their own confessors and seek out strangers, but should follow the example of good students at Paris, who choose by preference masters who are compatriots and well known to them. In the day of judgment priests, as well as people, will be held responsible for the proper study of the book of conscience, just as the chancellor, when he hears on Saturday the lessons of the boys in the grammar-schools, flogs the masters as well as the pupils if he thinks them to blame for the pupils' ignorance.

For the faults of the masters the preachers show little indulgence. Many begin to teach before they have studied long enough in the schools, an abuse which prevails in all faculties, but particularly in that of arts<sup>1</sup>. Such masters, says Jacques de Vitry, draw their lectures from books and closets, not from well-stored minds, but they succeed in securing students none the less, by personal solicitation and friendship and even by hiring them to come<sup>2</sup>. The number of their scholars is the masters' pride<sup>3</sup>; to crowd their class-

<sup>1</sup> "Quidam scolares ante tempus ablactari volunt et fiunt magistri, et hoc in quaque facultate." Philippe de Grève, sermon of August 21, 1226, MS. Avranches 132, f. 243v. "Multi qui adhuc deberent discere presumunt docere, quod vicium maxime in artibus inolevit." *Id.*, MS. Royal 8.F.13, f. 130v. Cf. his *Psalter*, edition of 1522, f. 8v; Nicolas de Nonancourt, MS. Lat. 16252, f. 279v.

<sup>2</sup> Pitra, *Analecta Novissima*, II. 359; Lecoy de la Marche, *Chaire Française*, 452. The hiring of scholars is also found at Bologna; see AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, III. 223, note 2.

<sup>3</sup> Guiard de Laon, MS. Amiens 284, f. 5v. Cf. Robert de Sorbon, MS. Lat. 15971, f. 176v: "Vidi Parisius multos magistros qui dimittebant legere quia non habebant multos auditores".

Hence their class-rooms should be large and easily accessible: "Scola est exposita cuilibet transeunti ut sciatur. . . . Item est fenestrata. . . . Item debet esse lata ut multos capiat". Guiard de Laon, MSS. Lat. 16471, f. 10; 16507, f. 8v. Cf.

rooms they preach new and strange doctrines<sup>1</sup>, and for money they will lecture even on Sundays and holy days<sup>2</sup>. Masters there are, too, who make life easy for the scholars who live with them, letting them sleep late in the morning and roam about and amuse themselves freely<sup>3</sup>, and even conniving at their vices<sup>4</sup>. The great aim of the master is not to instruct his pupils but to appear learned and be called rabbi<sup>5</sup>; many speak obscurely in order to appear more profound<sup>6</sup>, and even pay the headles to magnify them and cover up their ignorance<sup>7</sup>. Their quarrels are like cock-fights<sup>8</sup>, and they are so jealous that they seek to draw away one another's scholars<sup>9</sup> and, even when detained by illness, will not suffer their pupils to hear lectures from another<sup>10</sup>.

When we turn from studies and teachers to the students themselves, we find the material contained in the sermons fuller and more satisfactory. The ideal scholar of the pulpits was a rather colorless personage, obedient, respectful, eager to learn, and keeping very much to himself<sup>11</sup>. In order to win the favor of the master and his personal instruction<sup>12</sup>, one should be assiduous at lectures, quick at learning, and bold in debate, and should also attract other pupils to

Buoncompagno's description of an ideal Bolognese lecture-hall, Gaudenzi, *Bibliotheca Juridica Medii Aevi*, II. 279.

<sup>1</sup> "In discipulis coluntur magistri qui inaudita dicunt." Guiard de Laon, MS. Lat. 15959, f. 296v. Crane, *Jacques de Vitry*, 10, 11.

<sup>2</sup> "Illi qui pro argento diebus dominicis et festivis legunt debent saluti anime sue intendere ut laicis bonum exemplum ostenderent." Gautier de Château-Thierry, MS. Lat. 15959, f. 437, col. 2.

<sup>3</sup> "Magistri illi qui blandiuntur clericis suis et adulantur et dant eis licenciam spaciandi et ludendi et voluntatem faciendi habent plures scolares; sed illi qui artant suos timentur et paucos habent." Philippe de Grève, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS. 1009, f. 123v; Royal MS. 8.F.13, f. 271v.

<sup>4</sup> Hauréau, VI. 246. Cf. Jean de Monthéry, MS. Merton College 237, f. 227v: "Innocens iuvenis mittitur quandoque Parysius et exemplo mali socii vel forte magistri sui ita corumpitur et inficitur quod omnibus diebus vite sue non carebit illo vicio."

<sup>5</sup> "Nec magistri ad utilitatem audiunt, legunt, nec disputant, sed ut vocentur Rabbi." MS. Lat. n. a. 338, f. 197.

<sup>6</sup> MS. Lat. 16507, f. 48v.

<sup>7</sup> Hauréau, VI. 124.

<sup>8</sup> Philippe de Grève, *Notices et Extraits des MSS.*, XXI. 2. 193; *Journal des Savants*, 1894, p. 431; Lecoy de la Marche, *Chaire Française*, 452; Valois, *Guillaume d'Auvergne*, 52.

<sup>9</sup> Pitra, *Analecta Novissima*, II. 362.

<sup>10</sup> "Contra magistros qui cum aliquando sint in vinculis infirmitatis vel alicuius occupationis non possunt sustinere quod discipuli sui alium audiant licet meliorem." Guiard de Laon, MS. Lat. 15951, f. 14.

<sup>11</sup> "Magistri propter quatuor diligunt discipulos: . . . primo quia obedientes; . . . secundo quia timorosi; . . . tercio quia solitarii, non in strepitu et confabulatione cum aliis; . . . quarto quia de addiscendo solliciti." Guiard de Laon, MS. Lat. 16471, f. 112v.

<sup>12</sup> "Mos est apud scolares quod discipuli cariores ab ipsis magistris edocentur." *Ibid.*, f. 253.



the master<sup>1</sup>. Robert de Sorbon lays down six rules for successful study: a fixed time for each subject, concentrated attention, memorizing specific things, note-taking, conference with others, and finally prayer, "which availeth much for learning"<sup>2</sup>. The good student should imitate Christ among the doctors, hearing many masters, always seeking good teachers without regard to their fame or place of birth, and listening as well as asking questions—unlike those who will not wait for the end of a question but cry out, "I know what you mean"<sup>3</sup>. Even when he goes to walk by the Seine in the evening, the good student ought to ponder or repeat his lesson<sup>4</sup>.

It need scarcely be said that the students of medieval Paris did not as a rule spend their time in such studious promenades; indeed if further evidence were needed to dispel the illusion that a medieval university was an institution devoted to biblical study and religious nurture, the preachers of the period would offer sufficient proof. We have already seen how the theological faculty, the only one dealing directly with religious subject-matter, was suffering from the competition of the canon law and other "lucrative" subjects, and it is on every hand apparent that the morals of at least a considerable portion of the student body were as profane as their studies<sup>5</sup>. Students, we are told, care nothing for sermons, and for most of them holy days are only an occasion for idleness<sup>6</sup>; they remain outside during mass, and like their masses short and their lectures and disputations long<sup>7</sup>. If their voice is in the choir, their mind is without, in the street, in bed, or at the table—as the rhyme ran<sup>8</sup>,

Vox in choro, mens in foro  
Vel in mensa vel in thoro.

Confession they likewise neglect; instead of seeking to have his soul cleansed by confession on his arrival at Paris<sup>9</sup>, the student hastens

<sup>1</sup> Anonymous, *ibid.*, f. 118v.

<sup>2</sup> Lecoy de la Marche, *Chaire Française*, 453.

<sup>3</sup> "Contra illos qui nolunt audire antequam respondeant sed clamant dicentes, Bene scio quid vultis dicere." Robert de Sorbon, MS. Lat. 15971, f. 146v.

<sup>4</sup> "Sic bonus scholaris sero debet ire spaciatur ad ripam Secane, non ut ibi ludatur sed lectionem repetat vel meditetur." *Ibid.*, f. 198.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Langlois, *Questions d'Histoire et d'Enseignement*, 5; Rashdall, II. 700-702.

<sup>6</sup> Bourgain, *Chaire Française*, 287; *Journal des Savants*, 1893, p. 372.

<sup>7</sup> "Contra illos qui gaudent de brevitate missarum et longitudine lectionum et disputationum et foris sunt dum cantatur missa." Gautier de Château-Thierry, MS. Lat. 15955, f. 228, col. 4.

<sup>8</sup> MS. Lat. 15971, f. 185.

<sup>9</sup> "Scolaris quando venit Parysius statim currit ad lotricem ut lavetur, non vadit ad confessionem ut mundetur eius cor." Jean de Montlhéry, MS. Merton College 237, f.

to the laundress. Dominicans like Étienne de Bourbon attend vespers, at Notre-Dame or elsewhere<sup>1</sup>, but a miracle or special providence is often needed in order to bring students or masters into this order<sup>2</sup>, and one subprior complains that parents are more anxious to keep their sons away from the friars than from the brothel or the tavern<sup>3</sup>. "The student's heart is in the mire", says another Dominican, "fixed on prebends and things temporal and how to satisfy his desires"<sup>4</sup>. "He is ashamed to sin against the rules of Donatus, but not to violate the law of Christ"<sup>5</sup>. He is much more familiar, says Robert de Sorbon, with the text of the dice, which he recognizes at once, no matter how rapidly they are thrown, than with the text of logic—yet the gloss of the dice he forgets, which is, Swear, steal, and be hanged<sup>6</sup>. Many students come to Paris like the prodigal to a far country and indulge in practices they would not even think of at home, wasting in riotous living not only their own portion but the substance of their churches<sup>7</sup>.

What the forms of riotous living were which prevailed among students the preachers do not hesitate to specify, sometimes with more particularity than modern taste permits. Gambling is men-

228. For other relations between students and *lotrices*, cf. the following, from the sermon of an anonymous chancellor: "Sic hodie faciunt lotrices Parisius. Bene sciunt totundere fatuos clericos. Illos ergo qui in luxuria vivunt Dallida expoliati et isti tonduntur". MS. Lat. 16502, f. 86v.

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Lecoy de la Marche, 317, 363.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 44, 86, 222, 345.

<sup>3</sup> Hauréau, III. 287.

<sup>4</sup> "Scolaris habet cor ad lutum, ad temporalia, ad prebendas et huiusmodi, et quomodo possit suam explorare libidinem [MS. libinem]." Jean de Monthéry, Ashmolean MS. 757, in the Bodleian, f. 160v.

<sup>5</sup> Quoted from St. Augustine in MS. Lat. 15959, f. 437, col. 1; MS. Lat. 15955, f. 430. Cf. Robert de Sorbon in Hauréau, V. 57.

<sup>6</sup> "Hoc faciunt aleatores et ludentes cum taxillis hodie, namque multi sciunt melius textum taxillorum, id est numerum punctorum. Quamcunque cito proiciantur statim vident asardum, et huiusmodi; unde melius sciunt textum taxillorum quam textum logice veteris. Tamen glosam nesciunt. Glosa taxillorum est hec: Iurabo, furabor, suspendar. Sic accidit ista septimana prope Parisius ad duas leucas de quodam sacerdote qui forte luserat in iuventute et modo non erat oblitus. . . . Lusit .x. libras et equum suum, post suspendit se. Hic est finis taxillorum." MS. Lat. 15971, f. 68. So in the same MS., f. 117v, he says: "Ludis ad talos, ribaldus eris. Probatio: Qui studet in libris grammatilibus gramaticus vult esse; ergo qui studet in libris ribaldorum, scilicet ludendo cum decis, ribaldus vult esse". Cf. Hauréau, "Les Propos de Maître Robert", 141.

<sup>7</sup> "Sic scolares abeunt in regionem longinquam cum veniunt Parisius et expendant aliquando non solum portionem propriam sed paternam et maternam et fraternam necnon bona ecclesie." Guiard de Laon, MS. Arras 329, f. 59v; MS. Lat. 16471, f. 39. Pierre de Poitiers, in Bourgain, *Chaire Française*, 27, note, and 293 (where *inde* should be read in place of the *mihi* from which Bourgain infers the chancellor's feeling of responsibility for the scholars' morals); Hauréau, VI. 256; Gautier de Château-Thierry, MS. Lat. 15959, f. 434v.

tioned<sup>1</sup>, even on the altars of churches<sup>2</sup>, and feasting and free indulgence in the wine-cup<sup>3</sup>, as well as wild carouses in the streets and the visiting of disreputable resorts<sup>4</sup>, which were often found in close proximity to the class-rooms<sup>5</sup>. Many of the students led a life that was by no means celibate<sup>6</sup>, and there are allusions to the darkest of monastic vices<sup>7</sup>.

Whatever their other virtues, the students of medieval Paris were not distinguished for their love of peace and quiet. Theirs was a rough and violent age, and what with the *prévôt's* men and the townsmen, the monks of St. Germain and the friars, there was no lack of opportunity for a brawl, in which the students were only too likely to be the aggressors. "They are so litigious and quarrelsome that there is no peace with them: wherever they go, be it Paris or Orleans, they disturb the country, their associates, even the whole university"<sup>8</sup>. Many of them go about the streets armed, attacking the citizens, breaking into houses, and abusing women<sup>9</sup>. They quar-

<sup>1</sup> Besides the passages from Robert de Sorbon just quoted, see Jacques de Vitry, ed. Crane, 8; and MS. Tours 468, f. 80, printed below, p. 25, note 4. The more common offenses committed by students against ecclesiastical discipline are illustrated by a blanket form of the papal penitentiary, or letter of "Licet non credas", covering acts which may have been committed by a clerk when a student and have afterward been forgotten: "Quod olim in diversis terris, locis et studiis generalibus vel aliis fuisti, in clericos seculares, presbyteros vel alias religiosas et ecclesiasticas personas interdum causa ludi, correctionis vel alia irato animo manus temere violentas usque et citra sanguinis effusionem iniciendo absque alio excessu difficili vel enormi, arma portando, ad taxillos et alios illicitos ludos ludendo, tabernas, ortos, vineas, prata et alia loca vetita et inhonesta intrando . . . nec non doctoribus, magistris, bedellis et bacallariis salaria statutis terminis non solvendo". Formulary of Benedict XII, in the Vatican library, MS. Ottoboni 333, f. 72v. A somewhat different text is published from MS. Tours 594 by Denifle in the *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, IV. 207.

<sup>2</sup> *Chartularium*, I., No. 470.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Pierre le Mangeur in Bourgain, *Chaire Française*, 292. The best evidence on this point is of course to be found in the drinking-songs and in the records of the nations.

<sup>4</sup> Prévostin, in Hauréau, III. 166; *Mélanges Julien Havet*, 303; Lecoy de la Marche, *Chaire Française*, 460. See also the passages cited below in regard to the carrying of arms.

<sup>5</sup> See on this point the well-known passage of Jacques de Vitry, *Historia Occidentalis* (ed. Douai, 1597), 278; reproduced in Rashdall, II. 690; and on its interpretation, Denifle, *Universitäten*, I. 672.

<sup>6</sup> Jacques de Vitry, *loc. cit.*; Pitra, *Analecta Novissima*, II. 434; Hauréau, III. 319; Étienne de Bourbon, 50, 402, 406; *Histoire Littéraire*, XXVI. 458; and the characteristic story told in MS. Auxerre 35, f. 127v.

<sup>7</sup> Jacques de Vitry, *loc. cit.*; Gautier de Château-Thierry, in Hauréau, VI. 210, and *Histoire Littéraire*, XXVI. 393; anonymous Minorite, Hauréau, VI. 257.

<sup>8</sup> "Videbitis etiam aliquos sic rixosos, discolos, et litigiosos quod nullo modo potest cum eis haberi pax. Ubique sunt, Parisius vel Aurelianis, perturbant totam terram et totam societatem cum qua sunt, immo totam universitatem." Jean de Montlhéry, MS. Lat. 14955, f. 140v; translated in *Histoire Littéraire*, XXVI. 437. On the litigiousness of the time cf. Philippe de Grève (MS. Avranches 132, f. 242; MS. Troyes 1099, f. 138): "Tanta increvit malicia ut laicus laicum, clericus clericum, etc., scholaris scolarem ad remotos iudices trahat, non ut consequatur iusticiam sed ut adversarius redimat vexationem".

<sup>9</sup> "Qui portant arma . . . qui frangunt hospicia, mulieres rapiunt, inter se aliquando

rel among themselves over dogs<sup>1</sup>, women, or what-not, slashing off one another's fingers with their swords<sup>2</sup>, or, with only knives in their hands and nothing to protect their tonsured pates, rush into conflicts from which armed knights would hold back<sup>3</sup>. Their compatriots come to their aid, and soon whole nations of students may be involved in the fray<sup>4</sup>. Some of these attacks are planned in advance at organized meetings of students<sup>5</sup>, which, according to Philippe de Grève, no impartial witness it is true, are largely given over to such matters. "In the old days," he says, "when each master taught for himself and the name of university was unknown, lectures and disputations were more frequent and there was more zeal for study. But now that you are united into a university, lectures and disputations are rare, things are hurried, and little is learned, the time taken from lectures being spent in meetings and discussions. In these assemblies, while the older heads are deliberating and legislating, the younger spend their time hatching the most abominable schemes and planning their nocturnal raids"<sup>6</sup>. Outsiders might also indulge in these student escapades, donning the scholar's garb in order to escape arrest by the civil authorities<sup>7</sup>.

se occidunt, hii sunt carnifices diaboli, non clerici." Gautier de Château-Thierry, MS. Lat. 15959, f. 436, col. 4. "Hoc est contra petulantiam quorundam vitulorum, id est scolarium, non Dei sed diaboli, qui quasi vituli prosiliunt de nocte discurrentes." Guiard de Laon, MS. Lat. 15959, f. 13v. Philippe de Grève, *Journal des Savants*, 1894, p. 430. Prévostin, in Hauréau, III. 166. On students who carry arms cf. the *Chartularium*, I., Nos. 213, 426, 470; and on quarrels with tradesmen, Jean de Garlande, *Dictionarius*, ed. Scheler, c. 35.

<sup>1</sup> Hauréau, VI. 250.

<sup>2</sup> "Heu hodie non precinguntur scolares hoc lintheo sed potius gladio belli. . . . Nostri clerici sero cum gladiis invicem pugnarunt et quidam ex illis digitos alterius amputant." Philippe de Grève, MS. Lat. n. a. 338, f. 155.

<sup>3</sup> Remark attributed to Philip Augustus, Hauréau, VI. 250.

<sup>4</sup> Anonymous Dominican, *ibid.*; Nicolas de Nonancourt, *ibid.*, IV. 157 (where, as in MS. Lat. 16252, f. 279, the last sentence should begin, "Ex certa malicia movent"). Hauréau strangely misunderstands the latter passage as referring to the nations of Europe instead of to the nations of the university. Cf. also Rutebeuf, "Li Diz de l'Université de Paris", vv. 37-39 (ed. Kressner, 51).

<sup>5</sup> Eudes de Châteauroux, *Journal des Savants*, 1890, p. 305. Cf., for the fourteenth century, *Chartularium*, II., No. 1072.

<sup>6</sup> Translated by Hauréau in *Journal des Savants*, 1894, p. 430. Philip expresses his opinion of the university organization in another sermon: "Circumit scolae et invenit monstruositatem. Monstrum in uno corpore diversarum coniunctio naturarum. Quid est ergo ex diversis nationibus universitatem facere nisi monstrum creare? . . . Quattuor capita huius monstri sunt quattuor facultates, logice, phisice, canonice et divini iuris". MS. Mazarine 1009, f. 159v; MS. Lat. 15955, ff. 126v-127.

<sup>7</sup> "Falsorum scolarium qui sub nomine scolarium et habitu flagitia perpetrant licentius quam scolares, quia prepositi non audent manus immittere." Philippe de Grève, MS. Mazarine 1009, f. 57v; MS. Lat. 15955, f. 96v; MS. Rouen 615, f. 53v.

The allusions of the preachers to the disturbances at Paris are seldom very specific

More interesting than these general characterizations in which the sermons abound are the incidental allusions to the ordinary life of the thirteenth-century student. The preachers take us into the very atmosphere of the Latin quarter and show us much of its varied activity. We hear the cries<sup>1</sup> and songs of the streets<sup>2</sup>—

Li tens s' en veit,  
Et je n' ei riens fait;  
Li tens revient,  
Et je ne fais riens—

the students' tambourines and guitars<sup>3</sup>, their "light and scurrilous words"<sup>4</sup>, their hisses<sup>5</sup> and handclappings and loud shouts of applause at sermons and disputations<sup>6</sup>. We watch them as they mock a neighbor for her false hair<sup>7</sup> or stick out their tongues and make faces at

(cf. Eudes de Châteauroux in Pitra, *Analecta Novissima*, II. 230, and Hauréau, II. 119; Philippe de Grève in MS. Avranches 132, ff. 24, 263v). There are, however, various references to the disorders of 1273 (Lecoy de la Marche, *Chaire Française*, 85, 451; Quéuf and Échard, *Scriptores Ordinis Prædicatorum*, I. 269); and some points of interest in regard to the dispersion of 1229 are indicated in a contemporary sermon of Philippe de Grève: "Habebant scolares tamquam apes domos exagonas Parisius, id est studio competentes, edificabant favos quibus demulcebant affectum et illuminabant intellectum . . . Sed aspersum est origanum super loca ipsorum, . . . fugerunt et florigeras regiones lustraverunt ut quietem invenirent, suspirantes nihilominus ad loca dimissa, quia spes est quod bonus et prudens paterfamilias, scilicet summus pontifex, purget amaritudinem origanni ut ad loca propria revertantur. Felix locus et felix civitas que filios dispersos pie collegit, pie dico scilicet ut eos nutriet et postmodum matri restitueret, quia signum est quod talis nutrix non diligit dispersionem. Non sic autem illa que quos nutriet sibi retinere intenderet, ut Andegavis, de qua impletur illud Jeremie [xvii. 11], Perdix fovit que non peperit. . . Videtur inter alias Aurelianus sic quos recepit habuisse, non tamquam emula sed tamquam nutrix et gerilla, et recte quia inter alias Parisiensis civitas soror est. . . Ruben, filius visionis, scolares, . . . terra Moabitidis civitas Andegavis. . . Bonus paterfamilias . . . scripsit regi ut scholaribus iusticie plenitudinem exhiberet et eos in Betleem, id est domum panis que est Parisius, revocaret ac libertates eisdem a felici memorie rege Philippo pie indultas liberaliter et inviolabiliter conservaret." "Sermo cancellarii Parisiensis quem fecit Aurelianus ad scolares de recessu scolarium a Parisius, quem fecit in vigilia Pasche." MS. Avranches 132, f. 340v; MS. Troyes 1099, f. 160v.

<sup>1</sup> See the story in Étienne de Bourbon, 185, of the poor scholar who substituted the cries of dealers in old clothes for the words of the church service; and cf. the poem of Guillaume de la Villeneuve, "Les Crieries de Paris", in Franklin, *Les Cris de Paris* (Paris, 1887), 133.

<sup>2</sup> Hauréau, III. 341; Étienne de Bourbon, 346.

<sup>3</sup> *Histoire Littéraire*, XXVI. 458.

<sup>4</sup> "Verba levia et scurrilia. Talia sunt verba multorum scolarium." Richard, Minorite, in MS. Lat. n. a. 338, f. 54. Cf. the story of the student who blasphemed against Abraham, Cæsar of Heisterbach, ed. Strange, I. 192.

<sup>5</sup> "Dico de scolaribus, quia multi peccant lingua aliter quam loquendo, sicut illi clerici qui sibilant." Philippe de Grève, MS. Alençon 153, f. 58. Cf. Du Cange, under *sibillacio*.

<sup>6</sup> Anonymous sermons in Hauréau, II. 108, VI. 257.

<sup>7</sup> "Isabel, ceste queue n'est pas de ce veel." *Ibid.*, IV. 177; Étienne de Bourbon, 239.

the passers-by<sup>1</sup>. We see the student studying by his window<sup>2</sup>, talking over his future with his room-mate<sup>3</sup>, receiving visits from his parents<sup>4</sup>, nursed by friends when he is ill<sup>5</sup>, singing psalms at a student's funeral<sup>6</sup>, or visiting a fellow-student and asking him to visit him—"I have been to see you, now come to our hospice"<sup>7</sup>.

All types are represented. There is the poor student, with no friend but St. Nicholas<sup>8</sup>, seeking such charity as he can find<sup>9</sup> or earning a pittance by carrying holy water<sup>10</sup> or copying for others—in a fair but none too accurate hand<sup>11</sup>—, sometimes too poor to buy books or afford the expense of a course in theology<sup>12</sup>, yet usually surpassing his more prosperous fellows, who have an abundance of books at which they never look<sup>13</sup>. There is the well-to-do student, who besides his books and desk will be sure to have a candle in his room<sup>14</sup> and a comfortable bed with a soft mattress and luxurious coverings<sup>15</sup>, and

<sup>1</sup> "Idem potest dici de scolariis qui linguam protrahunt et naso subsannant et supercilium supprimunt digitum extendentes in derisione coram se transeuntium." Guiard de Laon, MS. Lat. 15959, f. 135.

<sup>2</sup> Hauréau, III. 341; Étienne de Bourbon, 346.

<sup>3</sup> MS. Tours 468, f. 78, printed above, p. 12, note 2.

<sup>4</sup> See the story of the student who was ashamed to receive a visit from his father and made him eat with the servants. Munich, Cod. Lat. 23420, f. 170.

<sup>5</sup> Odo of Cheriton, in Hervieux, *Fabulistes Latins*, IV. 295.

<sup>6</sup> Caesar of Heisterbach, ed. Strange, I. 37.

<sup>7</sup> "Nota quod socius quando socium visitavit, Veni ad vos, modo venite ad nostrum hospiciū." Anonymous, MS. Lat. 16505, f. 203v.

<sup>8</sup> "Hinc est quod pauperes clerici qui non habent qui figant illos in ecclesia Dei, beatum Nicholaum invocent." Eudes de Châteauroux, MS. Lat. 16471, f. 48.

<sup>9</sup> *Journal des Savants*, 1887, p. 122; Lecoy de la Marche, *Chaire Française*, 462.

<sup>10</sup> Jacques de Vitry, ed. Crane, 47, ed. Pitra, 451; Étienne de Bourbon, 446.

<sup>11</sup> "Pauperes enim scolares manu sua propria sibi vel aliis scribunt, quod sibi fideliter, quod aliis pulcre et velociter." Guiard de Laon, MS. Lat. 15951, f. 372v.

<sup>12</sup> Lecoy de la Marche, *loc. cit.* On the expense of a theological course cf. AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, III. 221.

<sup>13</sup> "Sepe visum est Parisius quod clerici qui vivunt de beneficio istorum clericorum divitum multi plus proficiebant in scientia et vita quam ipsi divites de quibus vivebant et a quibus victum recipiebant, et ita probi et magni clerici fiebant quod postea ipsi divites eis serviebant. . . . Non propter hoc dico quod vir religiosus non possit plus sibi proficere si sit sollicitus circa se quam secularis, sicut videmus de clerico divite. Non dico quin plus possit proficere in scientia et virtute si velit esse sollicitus de profectu suo quam pauper possit. Nec hoc est mirum, *car il a plus d'avantages* et melius habet victum suum et libros sibi necessarios et magistros magis paratos circa se." Robert de Sorbon, Munich, Cod. Lat. 23372, pp. 124-125. "Quidam habent multos et pulcros libros et bene paratos et nunquam ibi respiciunt. . . . Debet libros suos qui in eis nichil faciunt tradere pauperibus scolariis qui libenter addiscunt." *Id.*, MS. Lat. 15971, f. 198.

<sup>14</sup> "Si quis daret alicui scolari Parisius lumen per annum, multum diligeret eum." Lecoy de la Marche, *Chaire Française*, 461, note.

<sup>15</sup> Étienne de Bourbon, 29. There is an *exemplum* of a Paris student who dies and leaves his mattress to his companion to be given to the poor for the repose of his soul. The companion keeps the mattress for himself, whereupon he has a vision of the former owner lying in torment upon the hard, rough cords of a wooden bed; after he gives the mattress to the poor, he sees his friend lying in comfort upon a mattress. Jacques de Vitry, ed. Crane, 53, ed. Pitra, 452. MS. Auxerre 35, f. 80v.

will be tempted to indulge the medieval fondness for fine raiment beyond the gown and hood and simple wardrobe prescribed by the statutes<sup>1</sup>. Then there are the idle and aimless, drifting about from master to master and from school to school and never hearing full courses or regular lectures. Some, who care only for the name of scholar and the income which they receive while attending the university, go to class but once or twice a week, choosing by preference the lectures on canon law, which do not begin till nine in the morning<sup>2</sup> and thus leave them plenty of time for sleep<sup>3</sup>. Many eat cakes in the morning when they ought to be at study<sup>4</sup>, or go to sleep in the class-rooms, spending the rest of their time drinking in taverns or building castles in Spain (*castella in Hispania*)<sup>5</sup>; and when it is time to leave Paris<sup>6</sup>, in order to make some show of learning such students get together huge volumes of calfskin, with wide margins and fine red bindings, and so with wise sack and empty mind they go back to their parents. "What knowledge is this", asks the preacher, "which thieves may steal, mice or moths eat up, fire or water destroy?"<sup>7</sup>; and he cites an instance where the student's horse fell into a river, carrying all his books with him<sup>8</sup>. Some never go home, but continue to enjoy in idleness the fruits of their benefices<sup>9</sup>. Even in vacation time, when the rich ride off with their servants<sup>9</sup> and the poor trudge

On the furniture found at Paris in this period, see Jean de Garlande, *Dictionarius*, ed. Scheler, cc. 55, 56. It is not so clear as Rashdall (II, 668) supposes that c. 55 refers to student hostels.

<sup>1</sup> *Chartularium*, I., Nos. 20, 201, 202, 448, 501. See also the beginning of the poem "De presbytero et logico", in Hauréau, VI, 310; Wright, *Latin Poems attributed to Walter Mapes*, 251. There are allusions to the cope and hood in Hauréau, IV, 51; Étienne de Bourbon, 406; Jacques de Vitry, ed. Crane, 12. Jean de Monthéry says: "Scolaris bene custodit capam novam: pueri quandoque infingunt tibias suas in luto et dicunt se esse bene calciatos". Merton College, MS. 237, f. 227v.

<sup>2</sup> Ordinarily the first lecture of the day seems to have come at six. Rashdall, II, 652.

<sup>3</sup> Jacques de Vitry, ed. Pitra, 363.

<sup>4</sup> Hauréau, IV, 39, 248. Cf. an anonymous Minorite, MS. Lat. 15005, f. 160v: "Sunt enim solliciti in cibos delectabiles, unde libenter pastillant et huiusmodi".

<sup>5</sup> Eudes de Châteauroux, in Lecoy de la Marche, *Chaire Française*, 463.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Robert de Sorbon (MS. Lat. 15971, f. 84): "Quando clerici diu fuerunt Parisius et volunt recedere, ipsi corrigunt libros suos quia extra Parisius non invenirent exemplaria ad corrigendum."

<sup>7</sup> "Dixit quidam de quibusdam fatuis scolariis sic: In nugis sunt subtiles, in necessariis tardi et ebetes, et ne nichil fecisse videantur cum repatriaverint, de pellibus vitulinis cum latis spaciis magna componunt volumina eaque pellibus rubeis et pulcris vestiunt, et sic cum sapienti sacculo sed cum insipienti animo ad parentes redeunt. Que est ista scientia quam fur subripere, mus rodere, tinea demoliri, aqua delere, ignis comburere potest?" MS. Lat. 15971, f. 198; translated in *Histoire Littéraire*, XXVI, 465.

<sup>8</sup> Gautier de Château-Thierry, in Hauréau, VI, 210; translated in *Histoire Littéraire*, XXVI, 392.

<sup>9</sup> "Quidam scolaris nobilis et iuvenis multum Parisius morans tempore vacationis ivit in equis suis cum magistris et familia circumquaque Parisius spaciatur et declinans ad quandam abbaciam Cisterciensis ordinis. . . ." MS. Tours 468, f. 75.



home under the burning sun<sup>1</sup>, many idlers remain in Paris to their own and the city's harm.<sup>2</sup> Medieval Paris, we should remember, was not only the incomparable "parent of the sciences", but also a place of good cheer and good fellowship and varied delights<sup>3</sup>, a favorite resort not only of the studious but of country priests on a holiday<sup>4</sup>; and it would not be strange if sometimes scholars prolonged their stay unduly and lamented their departure in phrases which are something more than rhetorical commonplace.<sup>5</sup>

We get glimpses, too, of the troop of hangers-on who always thrive in a university town, bedels and servants and furnishers and other "emptiers of purses"<sup>6</sup>—like the vendors of fancy wafers (*nîules*), who make a handsome profit by visiting the students at meal-times and spreading their tempting wares on the table<sup>7</sup>. The bedels are represented as imposing but ignorant persons, fond of good eating and drinking<sup>8</sup>, whose multifarious duties put them in a position of considerable influence and gave them many opportunities for acquiring money<sup>9</sup>. They levied toll on the scholars for good seats in the lecture-halls<sup>10</sup>, exacted a goodly purse at inceptions<sup>11</sup>, and for a sufficient sum were ready to glorify ignorant masters<sup>12</sup>. The well-to-do student might have a servant of his own, to carry his books to class<sup>13</sup>, etc., but ordinarily one servant seems to have sufficed for a number of students of more modest needs<sup>14</sup>. By all accounts

<sup>1</sup> "Quando ego veni semel de scolis in estate, pater meus vix cognovit me, ita fui denigratus in via propter solem." Robert de Sorbon, MS. Lat. 15971, f. 116.

<sup>2</sup> Jean de Montlhéry, *Histoire Littéraire*, XXVI. 437.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Hauréau, IV. 248; and the poem printed in Raynaud, *Motets Français*, I. 277.

<sup>4</sup> See chapter 26 of the synodal statutes of Eudes de Sully, bishop of Paris, in Migne, *Patrologia*, CCXII. 66.

<sup>5</sup> See for example the lament of a Picard scholar published by Langlois, *Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement*, XXIII. 561 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Jean de Garlande, *Dictionarius*, ed. Scheler, c. 69. Cc. 19, 30, 31, 34, and 35 mention various tradesmen who had frequent dealings with the Paris students.

<sup>7</sup> "Consuetudo est in aliquibus terris, ut Parisius, quod *lo neuliers* qui facit nebulas veniet ad domum clericorum vel aliorum, et si potest intrare in hora comestionis veniet et proiciet nebulas per mensam et tunc dicit quod nesciret modum et consuetudines. Dicitur de isto homine, Quam largus est! sed certe antequam recedat ipse pro illo debili encenio reportabit quod valebit in quadruplo." MS. Lat. 15971, f. 155v. Cf. Jean de Garlande, *loc. cit.*, c. 30.

<sup>8</sup> "Tales . . . similes sunt bedellis qui semper sunt in scolis sine libris et nihil ad-discunt nisi curias querere et bene comedere et bene bibere." Guiard de Laon, MS. Lat. 16471, f. 248v.

<sup>9</sup> On the duties of bedels see particularly the *Chartularium*, I., No. 369.

<sup>10</sup> Hauréau, VI. 125.

<sup>11</sup> *Chartularium*, *loc. cit.*

<sup>12</sup> Hauréau, VI. 124.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 311; Pitra, *Analecta Novissima*, II. 363.

<sup>14</sup> "Mulier est quasi serviens pluribus scholaribus qui vix potest satisfacere, sed virgo cogitat que Deo sunt." Guiard de Laon, MS. Lat. 15959, f. 455v. Cf. Berger, *Régestes d'Innocent IV.*, No. 2525; and the next note.

these servants were a thieving lot, and Jacques de Vitry has a good story to tell of their skill in defrauding their masters. The servants, it appears, had a sort of chief or captain, who one day brought them together and began to question them as to their professional attainments. One after the other explained how he could make one, two, even three farthings on the penny, until the cleverest of all declared that he could pocket a penny for each farthing. "I buy", he said, "mustard from the dealer who furnishes me the vegetables, candles, and so on for my masters, and every time I get mustard I set it down at a farthing, though I get only a quarter of a farthing's worth. Then, as I am a regular customer, the dealer throws in a fifth portion, which I also reckon at a farthing, and so I gain four farthings for one"<sup>1</sup>.

Other aspects of every-day life are illustrated in various stories of the students and their doings which the preachers have preserved. One clerk has a dog which he calls Rose and teaches to walk on its fore legs; another clerk steals it, names it Violet and teaches it to walk on its hind legs, so that it refuses to obey its former master when he claims it in the bishop's court<sup>2</sup>. Certain students amuse themselves over their dice by putting one of the dice in a cat's paws; if the cat wins, they give it something to eat, if not, they kill it and sell its skin<sup>3</sup>. In another *exemplum* the students were playing for a dinner, when one of them seized a neighbor's cat which frequented the house, and said: "He eats here and never pays his reckoning. He shall pay". So they made the cat throw, and when he lost they tied to his neck a bill for a quart of wine and sent him home, threatening to take his skin if the owner did not pay. The owner sent back the cat with the money, but begged them not to force him to play again, as he could not count.<sup>4</sup> A student is drinking in his room with some friends, when he sees a thief under the bed. He asks them, "Did you give our brother there anything to drink?" Then they beat the thief.<sup>5</sup> A companion of Étienne de Bourbon is

<sup>1</sup> Jacques de Vitry, ed. Crane, 87, ed. Pitra, 456; Étienne de Bourbon, 372; Wright, *Latin Stories*, 113; translated in Lecoy de la Marche, *L'Esprit de nos Anciens*, 186.

<sup>2</sup> MS. Auxerre 35, f. 96; printed by Delisle in *Histoire Littéraire*, XXXI. 59.

<sup>3</sup> Jacques de Vitry, ed. Crane, 8.

<sup>4</sup> "Clerici quidam Parisius ludebant ad talos pro quadam cena, et quidam amittens [MS. admittens] accepit catum cuiusdam vicini eorum stantem iuxta eos qui frequentabat domum, et ait, Iste ludet vobiscum qui frequenter hic comedit et nunquam solvit symbolum; et ponens taxillum [MS. taxillo] intra iiiij<sup>or</sup> pedes cati eum fecit proicere, et amisit. Et ponens cedulam ad collum eius scripsit amisisse quartam vini, quam nisi solveret pellem dimitteret, quod videns dominus eius ligavit peccuniam in collo cati, rogans ne compellerent eum ludere de cetero, *car il ne savoit compter sa chance*." *Compilatio singularis exemplorum*, MS. Tours 468, f. 80.

<sup>5</sup> "Clerici scolares Parisius bibebant in camera unius sociorum, et vidit unum latronem asconditum sub lecto et ait, Dedistisne illi socio ad bibendum? quem egregie correxerunt." *Ibid.*, f. 79v.

at vespers on Christmas eve, when a thief enters his room and steals his law-books. When the student comes to use the books after the holidays, he cannot find them and seeks help from a necromancer, who accuses an innocent relative of the student. Finally the real thief is forced to take sanctuary in a church tower and confesses to the theft, giving the residence of the Jew with whom he had pawned the books<sup>1</sup>.

The principal student festivals mentioned in the sermons are Saint Nicholas's day, Christmas, and inceptions. The feast of Saint Nicholas, the patron saint of scholars, was one of the great days in the student calendar. There was a mystery, in which clerks or maidens impersonated the saint and his miracles<sup>2</sup>, and then came feasting<sup>3</sup> and games and dancing and the rest<sup>4</sup>. Christmas eve was likewise made an occasion for revelry, with dicing and drinking and wild Bacchic processions<sup>5</sup>, so that some "committed more sins at Christmas time than during all the rest of the year"<sup>6</sup>. The inception celebrations also fell under the displeasure of the moralists of the pulpit, for besides the inevitable banquet there were likely to be masquerades<sup>7</sup> and processions and round dances (*choreæ*)<sup>8</sup> in the

<sup>1</sup> Étienne de Bourbon, 317; translated in Lecoy de la Marche, *L'Esprit de nos Aïeux*, 289.

<sup>2</sup> Hauréau, IV. 76.

<sup>3</sup> See the story in Étienne de Bourbon, 51, of the barber who stole a pig for the clerks whom he was to entertain on this day.

<sup>4</sup> See particularly Étienne de Besançon, in Hauréau, IV. 208. The following passage from Prévostin may be noted in this connection: "Quidam enim scolares qui student vimencie ad turbam vadunt Nicolaitarum, quam viri catholici semper oderunt, et surgunt ad vocem volucris que gallus dicitur, sed obsurdescunt in eis filie carminis". Sermon "in epiphania", British Museum, Add. MS. 18335, f. 13v. On cock-fights among scholars, cf. Hauréau, IV. 274; Lecoy de la Marche, *Chaire Française*, 452, note. Another game, probably also among the students of the grammar-schools, is alluded to in a Lenten sermon of a chancellor (Nicolas de Nonancourt?), MS. Lat. 15952, f. 113v: "Sicut in ludo scolarium, gallice *avoir, dire, et amentir*". Cf. also MS. Lat. 15959, f. 191.

<sup>5</sup> "Sed ve illis scolaribus qui vigiliis bacancium et furiosorum cum tirsis et facibus candelarum ei [Deo] exhibent bachalia festa celebrantes." Guiard de Laon, sermon "in vigilia Nativitatis", MS. Lat. 15959, f. 132.

<sup>6</sup> Anonymous subprior, Hauréau, III. 287-288. Cf. Eudes de Châteauroux, *ibid.*, VI. 209.

<sup>7</sup> "Sed heu! modo non est disciplina Christi in clericis sed disciplina histrionum, quod patet in principiis magistrorum quando scolares diversificant se; portant enim in capite signum crucis sed in corpore portant dyabolium portando vestes histrionum." John Peckham, Library of St. Mark's at Venice, Fondo Antico, MS. 92, f. 205.

<sup>8</sup> "Sicut Deus habet suam processionem in qua portantur cerei flores et crux et vexilla, ita dyabolus suas habet processiones, scilicet choreas et circuitus per vicos etiam de nocte. Fiunt enim choree cum cantilenis et floribus rosarum et violarum in capellis capitulis et in manibus. Item circuitus fiunt per vicos cum cereis maxime a scolaribus in principiis et a laicis in nuptiis." Gautier de Château-Thierry, MS. Lat. 15955, f. 98, col. 3. Pierre de Bar sur-Aube, in Hauréau, VI. 243. Cf. Jacques de Vitry, in Étienne de Bourbon, ed. Lecoy de la Marche, 162, note.

streets and squares—the last-named form of amusement being in such disfavor with the church<sup>1</sup> and with the university authorities that candidates were obliged to swear that they would permit no *chorca* about their houses nor suffer anything improper at their inception<sup>2</sup>.

The account of Paris student life which has been thus put together from the sermons is not of course a rounded picture. There is much truth in Mark Pattison's aphorism that "history cannot be written from manuscripts", and in presenting the material contained in a single class of sources many aspects of university life must necessarily be neglected. To the preachers the university and its members are primarily a theme for moralizing, and they emphasize what best points their moral<sup>3</sup>. It is not their business to tell of the orderly working of university institutions, the eager enthusiasm for learning, the wholesome routine of academic life; they give only what suits their purpose, and we must be thankful for that. Furthermore, much of what the sermons contain on university matters is interesting as showing the state of mind of their authors rather than as yielding specific information, and allowance must of course be made for the official position of some of the preachers as well as for the pulpit equation in general. What the preachers set out to say is usually of less historical importance than what they tell us unintentionally and incidentally. Still, when all deductions have been made, there remains a substantial residuum of fact which adds materially to our knowledge of academic conditions in the thirteenth century and to our sympathetic understanding of the human background of a great medieval university.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

<sup>1</sup> See the stories of demons afflicting the dancers, in Étienne de Bourbon, 161, 226, 232, 397 ff.; and Hauréau, IV. 161.

<sup>2</sup> *Chartularium*, I., Nos. 202, 501.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the observations of Langlois in Lavissee, *Histoire de France*, III. 2. 354.

## ENGLISH POETRY AND ENGLISH HISTORY

My subject is not English poetry or the history of English poetry, but the connection of English poetry with English history. What is poetry? Besides reason, of which the highest manifestation is science, man has sentiment, distinct from reason though bound to keep terms with it on pain of becoming nonsense, as it not very seldom does. Sentiment seems to imply a craving for something beyond our present state. Its supreme expression is verse, music of the mind connected with the music of the voice and ear. There is sentiment without verse, as in writers of fiction and orators; as there is verse without sentiment, in didactic poetry, for example, which Lucretius redeems from prose and sweetens, as he says himself, to the taste by the interspersions of sentimental passages. Sentiment finds its fittest expression in verse. The expression in its origin is natural and spontaneous. Then poetry becomes an art looking out for subjects to express, and sometimes looking rather far afield. So painting and sculpture, in their origin spontaneous imitation, become arts looking for conceptions to embody. We are here tracing the indications of English sentiment and character at successive epochs of the national history finding their expression in poetry.

Chaucer is the first English poet. He was preceded at least only by some faint awakenings of poetic life. It was in Anglo-Saxon that the Englishman before the Conquest chanted his song of battle with the Dane. It was in French that the troubadour or the trouvère relieved the dulness, when there was no fighting or hunting, in the lonely Norman hold. French was the language of the Plantagenets, even of Edward I, that truly English king. At last the English language rose from its serfdom shattered, adulterated, deprived of its inflections, its cognates, and its power of forming compound words, unsuited for philosophy or science, the terms for which it has to borrow from the Greek, but rich, apt for general literature, for eloquence, for song. Chaucer is the most joyous of poets. His strain is glad as that of the skylark which soars from the dewy mead to pour forth its joyance in the fresh morning air. He is at the same time thoroughly redolent of his age. In the Knight of the "Prologue" and in the tale of "Palamon and Arcite" we have that fantastic outburst of a posthumous and artificial chivalry of which Froissart is the chronicler, which gave birth to the Order of

the Garter and a number of similar fraternities with fanciful names and rules, and after playing strange and too often sanguinary pranks, as in the wicked wars with France, found its immortal satirist in the author of *Don Quixote*. In the sporting Monk, the sensual and knavish Friar, the corrupt *Sompnour*, the Pardoner with his pig's bones shown for relics, we have the Catholic church of the middle ages with its once ascetic priesthood and orders, its spiritual character lost, sunk in worldliness, sensuality, and covetousness, calling aloud for Wycliffe. At the same time in the beautiful portrait of the Good Parson we have a picture of genuine religion and an earnest of reform. Here Chaucer holds out a hand to Piers Ploughman, the poet-preacher of reform, social and religious, if poet he can be called who is the roughest of metrical pamphleteers. Chaucer's Good Parson is a figure in itself and in its connection with the history of opinion not unlike Rousseau's "Vicaire Savoyard". Close at hand is Wycliffe, and behind Wycliffe come John Ball and the terrible insurrection of the serfs. Chaucer's debt to Boccaccio and the Italian Renaissance is manifest; yet he is English and a perfect mirror of the England of his time.

There was at the same time an exuberance of national life which gave birth to ballad poetry. The English ballads as a class are no doubt inferior to the Scotch. Yet there is at least one English ballad of surpassing beauty. How can any collection of English poetry be thought complete without the ballad of "The Nut-Brown Maid?"

There follows an age unpropitious to poetry and all gentle arts. The glorious filibustering of Edward III and afterward of Henry V in France brings its punishment in a general prevalence at home of the spirit of violence, cruelty, and rapine. This, combined with aristocratic ambition and faction, plunges the country into the Wars of the Roses. At last the Tudor despotism brings calm after its kind. Helm and hauberk are changed by the court nobility for the weeds of peace, and toward the close of the reign of Henry VIII we have the twin poets Wyatt and Surrey; Surrey, the last of the tyrant's victims, produces poetry which makes him worthy to rank as a harbinger of the Elizabethan era.

The times of the Protectorate and of the Marian Reaction were dark and troublous, uncongenial to poetry. But clear enough is the connection between the springtide of national life in the Elizabethan era, and the outburst of intellectual activity, of poetry generally and especially of the drama. The worst of the storms were over. The government was firm; the religious question had been

settled after a fashion; the energies which had been ill-spent in civil war or marauding on France were turned to maritime adventure of the most romantic kind, or if to war, to a war of national defense combined with championship of European freedom. There was everything to excite and stimulate without any feeling of insecurity.

The next great poem after Chaucer is Spenser's "*Faërie Queene*", and it is intimately connected with English history. It presents in allegory the struggle of Protestantism, headed by England, with Catholicism, and embodies that new Protestant chivalry which arose in place of the chivalry of the middle ages, of which Sir Philip Sydney was the model knight, and of which perhaps we see the lingering trace in Fairfax, the general of the Commonwealth, a kinsman of the Fairfax who translated Tasso. The leading characters of the struggle, Elizabeth, the Pope, Mary Queen of Scots, and Philip of Spain, under thin disguises, are all there. Artegal, the Knight of Justice, and Spenser's model of righteousness in its conflict with evil, is the Puritan Lord Grey of Wilton, the stern, ruthless Lord Deputy of Ireland, whose policy was extermination. Spenser was Lord Grey's secretary and no doubt accompanied him to the scene of his merciless government. There Spenser would come into contact with Catholicism in its lowest and coarsest as well as in its most intensely hostile form. Afterward a grantee of an estate in land conquered from the Irish insurgents, he was brought into personal conflict with the Blatant Beast. He was intimate with Raleigh and other militant and buccaneering heroes of the Protestantism of the day. In "*The Shepherd's Calendar*" he shows by his avowal of sympathy with old Archbishop Grindal, under the faint disguise of "*Old Allgrind*", who was in disgrace for countenancing the Puritans, that he belonged to the Puritan section of the divided Anglican church. Fulsome and mendacious flattery of the woman who has been allowed to give her name to this glorious age is an unpleasant feature of Spenser's work, as it is of the other works and was of the court society of that time. It is perhaps pardonable, if in any case, in that of a poet who would not be taken or expect to be taken at his word.

In the drama we expect to find rather gratification of the general love of action and excitement, and of curiosity about the doings of the great, prevalent among the people, than anything more distinctly connected with the events and politics of the day.

Shakespeare himself is too thoroughly dramatic to reflect the controversies of his time. Like all those about him he is Royalist, conforms to court sentiment, and pays his homage to the Virgin



Queen. Probably he pays it also to her learned successor under the name of Prospero in "The Tempest". Raleigh treats the Great Charter as a democratic aggression on the rights of royalty. Shakespeare in "King John" does not allude to the Great Charter or to anything connected with it. In "Coriolanus" and in "Troilus and Cressida" there is strong antidemocratic sentiment, dramatic no doubt, but also with a personal ring. It is notable that Shakespeare nowhere alludes to the great struggle with Spain. But here again he is probably in unison with the court, which though forced into the conflict, was not heartily anti-Spanish and certainly not anti-despotic. In religion Shakespeare was a Conformist. He quizzes Nonconformists, both Papist and Puritan; but probably he did no more than conform. When he touches on the mystery of existence and on the other world, as in the soliloquy in "Hamlet" and in "Measure for Measure", it is hardly in a tone of orthodox belief. In the flower-market at Rome, not very far from the shrine of Ignatius Loyola, now stands the statue of Giordano Bruno, with an inscription saying that on the spot where Bruno was burned this statue was erected to him by the age which he foresaw. Bruno visited England in Shakespeare's time, and was there the center of an intellectual circle which sat with closed doors. Was Shakespeare perchance one of that circle?

Though not political in any party sense, Shakespeare is full of the national and patriotic spirit evoked by the circumstances of his time. He shows this in the battle scene of "Henry V". He shows it in the speech of the Bastard of Falconbridge in "King John", which is at the same time a complete confutation of the theory that Shakespeare was a Catholic, for no dramatic motive could have sufficed to call forth or excuse such an affront to his own church.

No person of sense, it may be presumed, doubts that Shakespeare wrote his own plays. Greene and Ben Jonson and Charles I and Milton thought he did. But, say the Baconians, how came a yeoman's son, brought up among bumpkins, and educated at a country grammar-school, to acquire that imperial knowledge of human nature in all its varieties and ranks? This is the one strong point in their case. But Shakespeare, in London, got into an intellectual set. Several of his brother playwrights were university men. The subject of the "Sonnets" was evidently not vulgar. But much may be explained by sheer genius. Among poets, two are preëminent: one lived in the meridian light and amidst the abounding culture of the Elizabethan era; the other in the very dawn of civilization, as some think before the invention of writing, sang, a wandering minstrel, in rude Æolian or Ionian halls, and the influence of Homer on the

world's imagination, though less deep, has been wider than that of Shakespeare. Shakespeare, though peerless, was not alone; perhaps he would not even have been peerless had Marlowe lived and worked, for in the last scenes of "Faust" and "Edward II" Marlowe rises to the Shakespearian height. The thoroughly national and popular character of the English drama is emphasized by contrast with the court drama of France. Unfortunately, it also shows itself in occasional adaptations to coarse tastes from which the divine Shakespeare is not free.

The remarkable connection of literary and poetic life with the life of action and adventure which marks the Elizabethan era is seen especially in the works of Sydney and Raleigh. The close of the era is pathetically marked by the death song of Raleigh. The Laudian reaction has its religious poets, George Herbert, Vaughan, and Wither; the best of whom in every sense was George Herbert, his quaint and mystical style notwithstanding. George Herbert was the poetic ancestor of the author of "The Christian Year". One who spent a day with Keble in his Hampshire vicarage might feel that he had been in the society of George Herbert. In its general character and productions the Catholic reaction in the Anglican church at the present day is as nearly as possible a repetition of that of the seventeenth century, and its ultimate tendency is the same. The only differences are that the poetry of the present movement has not the quaintness or the conceits of that of the Laudian bards and that its architecture is a revival of the medieval Gothic, whereas that of the Laudians was Palladian.

The political side of the reaction also produced its poetry, very unlike that of the religious side, poetry written by Cavaliers—

"Our careless heads with roses bound  
Our hearts with loyal flames."

Of this school Lovelace was the best, though it was Montrose that wrote the famous lines

"I could not love thee, dear, so much,  
Lov'd I not honour more."

On the Puritan side comes one greater than all the Laudians and Cavaliers. Nothing else in poetry equals the sublimity of the first six books of "Paradise Lost". Their weak point is theological, not poetic. The hero of the piece and the object of our involuntary admiration and sympathy is the undaunted and all-daring majesty of evil. In Milton classic fancy, the culture of the Renaissance, and

even a touch of medieval romance were blended with the spiritual aspiration of the Puritan.

"But let my due feet never fail  
To walk the studious cloysters pale,  
And love the high embowered roof,  
With antic pillars massy proof  
And storied windows richly dight  
Casting a dim religious light."

The most classic things in our language are the "Comus" and the "Samson Agonistes"; but "Paradise Lost" and "Paradise Regained" are also cast in a classical mold.

A noble monument of the Puritan movement, though of its political rather than of its religious element, is Marvell's ode to Cromwell. Again we see the influence of the classics, which was not only literary but political and entered henceforth deeply into the political character of England.

The counterblast of Royalism to "Paradise Lost" was Butler's "Hudibras", the delight of Charles II and his courtiers, whose mental elevation may be measured thereby. It is a very poor travesty in verse of *Don Quixote*, with a Presbyterian Roundhead in place of the Don. Its principal if not its sole merits are the smart sayings of which it is a mine and its ingenious rhymes. There follows the riotous reaction of the flesh after the reign of the too-high soaring spirit under "our most religious and gracious King Charles II", as the Act of Parliament styles him. The poetry and drama native to that era are in keeping with the social life of the time and congenial to the seraglio of Whitehall. The poetry was in fact largely the work of the court set of debauchees. Dryden and Waller were originally the offspring of the bygone era and craftsmen of a higher and purer art. Both of them had written eulogies on the Protector. But if spiritual life was at a low ebb, the tide of political life was running high. It presently took the shape of a fierce and in the end sanguinary conflict between the two parties known afterward as Whigs and Tories. Dryden's "Absalom and Achitophel" is the offspring of that conflict. It is about the best political satire ever written, and its excellence depends largely on its dignity and moderation; for while Shaftesbury is politically the object of attack, his judicial merits are recognized, in fact greatly overrated, and the portraiture is true. The next episode in English politics, the attempt of James II to make himself absolute and force his religion on the nation, is likewise mirrored in Dryden's verse. The poet became a sudden convert, let us hope not wholly from mercenary motives, to the court religion, and we have a singular monument of his con-

version in "The Hind and the Panther", wherein one beast strives by a long argument in verse to persuade another beast to rest its religious faith on a pope and council. Hallam, however, is right in remarking that Dryden's special gift is the power of reasoning in verse.

We have now come to a period in which poetry most distinctly wears the character of an art. It is the period between the English Revolution and the premonitory rumblings of the great social and political earthquake which shook Europe at the end of the eighteenth century; a period of comparative calm and, generally speaking, of spiritual torpor, the Church of England dozing comfortably over her pluralities and tithes. Dryden, Pope, and Addison are not the first poets of this class; before them had been Waller, Denham, and others of whom it might clearly be said that, feeling in themselves a certain poetic faculty, they cultivated it for its own sake and for the praise or emolument which it brought them. Their characteristic is skill in composition rather than height of aspiration or intensity of emotion. The greatest of them are Dryden and Pope, though Dryden was a child of the Puritan era. The most consummate artificer of all is Pope. Nothing in its way excels "The Rape of the Lock", or indeed in its way the translation of the *Iliad*, little Homeric as the translation is. In the "Essay on Man" however and "The Universal Prayer", which is the hymn of a free-thinker, we meet with the sceptical philosophy which was undermining the foundations of religious faith and preparing the way for the great political revolution. The inspiration is that of Pope's friend and philosophic mentor, the Voltairean Bolingbroke. Pope reflects the fashionable sentiment of the time, which in English or in Parisian salons was a light scepticism, as Horace Walpole's writings show. In a more marked and truly astounding form does the growing scepticism present itself in that tremendous poem, Swift's "Day of Judgement". How must Voltaire have chuckled when he got into his hands lines written by a dignitary of the Anglican establishment and making the Creator of the Universe proclaim to his expectant creatures that all was a delusion and a farce! It is needless to say that Swift's works generally, including his verses, poems they can hardly be called, speak of the irreligious priest and the coming of a sceptical age.

Few now look into the minor poets of those times or read Johnson's criticism of them, the robust criticism of an unsentimental and unromantic school. Yet there is a certain pleasure in the feeling of restfulness produced by the total absence of strain. Their poetry marks the same era which is marked by Paley's theology and philoso-

phy, an era of calm before a great convulsion. In Gray and Collins we feel the growing influence of sentiment, which is one, though the mildest, of the premonitory signs of change. In Goldsmith's "Deserted Village" the social sentiment is mildly democratic.

The stream of European history is now approaching the great cataract. In England, notwithstanding Wilkes and Barré, there is no serious tendency toward political revolution. The movement there rather takes the form of religious revival, Methodism, evangelicism, social reform, and philanthropic effort. But if England had any counterpart to Rousseau, it was in Cowper, through whose "Table-Talk" with its companion essays in verse there runs a mild vein of social revolution. Nor did Cowper look with dismay or horror on the early stages of the Revolution in France. He speaks very calmly of the storming of the Bastille. He showed a distant sympathy with Burns, whose democratic sentiment

"A man's a man for a' that"

has been not the least of the sources of his immense popularity, though by his own confession he was willing to go to the West Indies as a slave-driver. We may recognize Burns as one of the foremost in the second class of poets, unsurpassed in his own line, without allowing ourselves to have his character thrust upon our sympathy. The union of high-poetic sensibility with what is low in character has been seen not in Burns only, but in Byron, in Edgar Poe, and in many others. If we are to pay homage to such a character as that of Burns because he was a great Scotch poet, why should we pay it to that paragon of pure-minded and noble-hearted gentlemen, Walter Scott?

The European crisis prepared by the teachings of Voltaire, Rousseau, and the Encyclopedists, combined with the decay of institutions and the accumulation of political abuses and ecclesiastical insincerities, had now come. It came unfortunately in an eminently excitable and impulsive nation, full of the vanity which Talleyrand notes as predominant in the Revolution. For some time, in spite of the weakness of the king, the meddlesome folly of the queen, and the demagogic eloquence of Mirabeau, fatally repelling the indispensable coöperation of the court with the Assembly, matters went pretty well. But at last, through a series of disastrous accidents and blunders, the Revolution fell into the hands of the vile mob of Paris and its Terrorist chiefs. Nobody could be blamed for being hopeful and sympathetic at first or despondent and dispirited after the September massacres.

Poetic natures, such as those of Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Southey, at first were naturally fired with enthusiasm and hope.

"O pleasant exercise of hope and joy!  
For mighty were the auxiliars which then stood  
Upon our side, we who were strong in love!  
Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive,  
But to be young was very heaven! — O times  
In which the meagre, stale, forbidding ways  
Of custom, law, and statute, took at once  
The attraction of a country in romance!  
When Reason seemed the most to assert her rights,  
When most intent on making of herself  
A prime Enchantress — to assist the work,  
Which then was going forward in her name "

In Coleridge, the great Pantisocrat, rather curiously, the recoil seems to have come first. Before Wordsworth and Southey, he had discovered that

"The Sensual and the Dark rebel in vain,  
Slaves by their own compulsion! In mad game  
They burst their manacles and wear the name  
Of Freedom, graven on a heavier chain!"

He presently became a most philosophic hierophant of orthodox politics and of the doctrine of the established church. In his peculiar way, in fact, he may be said to be about the greatest of Anglican divines. Wordsworth, it is needless to say, presently shared the recoil. The spirit of his poetry, whenever he touches on institutions, civil or religious, is thoroughly conservative. On the other hand, neither of these two men can be said to have turned Tory. They simply fell back on attachment to the national polity and principles. The French Revolution had ended naturally by giving birth to a military despot and conqueror, the struggle against whom was a struggle for the liberty of all nations. Southey became more decidedly Tory, and though he was one of the best and most amiable of men, drew upon himself Whig hatred and abuse. He lives chiefly by his *Life of Nelson*. Yet he is no mean poet. "The Curse of Kehama" is a splendid piece, full of the gorgeous imagery and the fantastic mythology of the East. Kehama, the impious rajah, whose career of insatiable ambition, after conquering earth and storming heaven, ends in his plucking on himself a miserable doom, is evidently Napoleon, whom as the arch-enemy of his kind, Southey regarded with the intense and righteous detestation, vented in the spirited ode on the negotiations with Bonaparte.

On the other side, we have in different lines Byron, Shelley, and Tom Moore. Keats may perhaps be regarded as one of the circle, though he wrote nothing distinctly in that sense. Byron is perhaps



more European than English. He left England at an early age, and though he revisited it did not settle, but spent the rest of his life mainly in Italy. Still more was he idiosyncratic. The self-presentation and self-worship which fill his poems are unparalleled, and considering the character of the man who thus pours out upon us his lacerated feelings and sentimental woes, one finds it difficult now to read the first cantos at all events of "*Childe Harold*" with much respect or pleasure. But the novelty of Byronism, its attractions for weak egotism, and the poetic dress which the writer's unquestionable genius gave it, helped perhaps in some measure by his rank and his personal beauty, made it the rage of the hour. As an Englishman, Byron was not a political revolutionist; in fact he always remained an aristocrat; but he was a social iconoclast. His great work, as his admirers probably say with truth, is "*Don Juan*", with its affected cynicism and unaffected lubricity. Macaulay sneers at British morality for its condemnation of Byron. British morality may be prudish, fitful, and sometimes hollow. But it has guarded the family and all that depends thereon, as Byron had good reason to know. Italian morality, however poetic, did not.

The connection of Shelley is rather with European history than with the history of England, though he could not shake himself free from the influences, attractive and repulsive, of his birthplace. His interest in the French Revolution is proclaimed in the opening of "*The Revolt of Islam*" and makes itself felt generally through the poem. A revolutionist Shelley was with a vengeance in every line, religious, political, social, moral, matrimonial, and even dietetic, wanting us to be vegetarians and marry our sisters. He was in fact an anarchist, though as far as possible from being a dynamiter; resembling the gentle Kropotkin of our day, who believes that we should all be good and happy if we would only do away with the police. It is curious to see the story of Prometheus, the great rebel against the tyrant of the universe, half written by Æschylus and finished in the same spirit, after the lapse of all those centuries, by Shelley. An Anglican college could not in those days help expelling a rampant propagator of atheism, though it has now adopted his memory and built him a strange and incongruous shrine within its courts. Nor could Eldon, as the legal guardian of the interests of Shelley's children, have left them in the hands of a father who would have brought them up to social ruin. Shelley, however, like Rousseau, was cosmopolitan. He withdrew from English citizenship to spend the rest of his days in Italy. Moreover, he was a being as intensely poetic and as little allied to earth in any way as his own skylark. He is not the first of poets in mental power, but he is, it

seems to me, the most purely and intensely poetic. What could lead my friend Matthew Arnold to disrate Shelley's poetry and put it below his letters, I never could understand. "A beautiful but ineffectual angel, beating in the void his luminous wings in vain"; such was Arnold's description of Shelley, and true it is that so far as any practical results of his poetic preaching were concerned, the angel did beat his wings in vain; but if he was luminous and beautiful, he fulfilled the idea of a poet.

Tom Moore clearly belongs to the history of his age. He is the bard of the Whigs in their fight with the Tory government, and of his native Ireland, then struggling for emancipation. He is a thorough Irishman with all the lightness and brilliancy of his race, with all its fun and with all its pathos. The pathos we have in "Paradise and the Peri", as well as in "Irish Melodies". The fun takes largely the form of political satire. Very good the satire is, though like almost all satire and caricature, it loses a part of its pungency by lapse of time. To enjoy it thoroughly you must have lived at least near to the days of the Regency, Eldon, Castlereagh, and Sidmouth.

On the other side we have Walter Scott. When he is named we think of the incomparable writer of fiction rather than of the poet. Yet surely the writer of "Marmion", of the introduction to "Marmion", and of the lyrical pieces interspersed in the tales, deserves a place, and a high place, among poets. Is not "Marmion" a noble piece and the most truly epic thing in our language, besides being most interesting as a tale? Scott is claimed politically and ecclesiastically by the party of reaction. It is said that he turned the eyes of his generation back from the sceptical and revolutionary present to the reverent and chivalrous past. He has even been cited as the harbinger of Ritualism. The romance, of which he was the wizard, certainly instils love of the past. So far he did belong to the reaction. But his motive was never political or ecclesiastical. Of ecclesiasticism there was nothing about him. He delighted in ruined abbeys, but a boon companion was to him "worth all the Bernardan brood who ever wore frock or hood". A Tory, and an ardent Tory, he was. An intense patriot he was in the struggle with revolutionary France and her emperor. A worshiper of monarchy he was, devout enough to adore George IV, but he was above all things a great artist, perfectly impartial in his choice of subjects for his art. Welcome alike to him were Tory and Whig, Cavalier and Roundhead, Jacobite and Covenanter, if they could furnish him with character. Happily for his readers, he never preaches, as some novelists do; yet we learn from him historical toleration and breadth of view, while we are

always imbibing the sentiments of a genial, high-minded, and altogether noble gentleman.

We must not forget Crabbe, who though as far as possible from being revolutionary, perhaps instils a slightly democratic sentiment by cultivating our social interest in the poor. Ebenezer Elliott, the author of the "Corn-Law Rhymes" and no mean poet, is a bard of the liberal movement and especially of free trade. Unless he was greatly mistaken, there can be no doubt about the source of industrial misery in his day.

Tennyson has been called a great teacher. The name is inappropriate, as any one who had known the man would feel. He was one of the greatest of poets, almost unrivaled in beauty of language and in melody. But he had nothing definite to teach. With fixed opinions he could not have been so perfectly as he was the mirror of intellectual society in his age. "There is more faith in honest doubt than in half the creeds." "There's something in this world amiss will be unriddled by and by." That was his mental attitude, and it was perfectly characteristic of a time in which old beliefs were passing away and new beliefs had not yet been formed; an age of vague spiritual hopes and yearnings, such as glimmer in "In Memoriam" and wherever Tennyson touches the subjects of God and religion and the mystery of being. In this sense his poetry is a chapter in the general history of the English mind. We see at the same time in his poems the advance of science, to which with consummate art he lends a poetic form. The revolt of woman is playfully treated in "The Princess". Reaction against the prevalent commercialism and materialism finds expression in the chivalrous "Idylls of the King". Tennyson is intensely patriotic and even militarist, though a man could not be imagined less likely to be found on a field of battle. In this also he represents an eddy in the current of national sentiment. In the well-known passage in "Maud" welcoming the Crimean War he thoroughly identified himself with English history, though he lived, like Lord Salisbury, to find that he had laid his money on the wrong horse.

The names of Aubrey de Vere and Frederick Taber on one side, those of Swinburne and Mrs. Barrett Browning on the other, show that English poetry has been lending its lyre to the expression of all the different sentiments, ecclesiastical, political, and social, of an age full of life and conflict. But the connection is rather with European than with English history. Matthew Arnold is the arch-connoisseur and general censor, appreciating all varieties and regulating them by his taste rather than connecting himself with anything national or special, unless it be the spirit of free thought which was consuming

England in his day. His poetry is simply high art. Of Browning I fear to speak. His characteristic poems do not give me pleasure of that sort which it is supposed to be the special function of poetry to give. He is a philosopher in verse with Browning societies to interpret his philosophy. He, again, symbolizes the general tendencies of an age, rather than any special period or phase of English history.

We seem now to have come to a break in the life of poetry in England and elsewhere; let us hope not to its close. There are good writers, Mr. Watson, for example. Swinburne with his revolutionary fervor is still with us. Edwin Arnold with his singular command of luscious language has only just left us. But neither in England nor anywhere else does there appear to be a great poet. Imagination has taken refuge in the novels, of which there is a deluge, though among them, George Eliot in her peculiar line excepted, there is not the rival of Miss Austen, Walter Scott, Thackeray, or Dickens. The phenomenon appears to be common to Europe in general. Is science killing poetic feeling? Darwin owns that he had entirely lost all taste for poetry, and not only for poetry but for anything esthetic. Yet Tennyson seems to have shown that science itself has a sentiment of its own and one capable of poetic presentation. Ours is manifestly an age of transition. Of what it is the precursor an old man is not likely to see.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

## THE NAMING OF AMERICA

THE voyages of the Florentine Amerigo Vespucci belong rather to the literary than to the geographical history of the New World. An acute observer of things new and strange and a clever writer, he became, through the publication of his letters in the countries beyond the Pyrenees, the principal source of information about the western Indies. In these narratives he made himself the central personality; in not one of them did he mention the name of the commander under whom he sailed, and consequently the impression easily gained ground that he was a discoverer. His place in the history of the discoveries is the most remarkable illustration of eternal celebrity won through a happy combination of the literary gift and self-advertisement, with the coöperation of the printing-press.

Amerigo Vespucci, generally known to the English world under a Latinized form of his name, Americus Vespucius, was born in Florence March 9, 1452, where he lived until some forty years of age.<sup>1</sup> He entered business life, became connected with the mercantile house of the Medici, and in 1492 went to Seville, in Spain, as its foreign agent. He first appears in the Spanish documents as employed in carrying out the contracts of an Italian merchant, Berardi, engaged in equipping vessels for the government for the service to the Indies. He apparently continued in this business as a contractor till 1499,<sup>2</sup> when the vicissitudes of business life finally led him to desire something more "stable and praiseworthy". He then resolved to "see . . . the world", and availed himself of the opportunity to join an expedition of four ships which was going out to discover new lands toward the west.<sup>3</sup>

It is at this point that the first puzzle in Vespucci's career or his character is met with. He says explicitly that the expedition sailed from Cadiz May 10, 1497; but there is no record, official or unofficial, outside of his letter, of such a voyage in 1497. Further, Columbus's monopoly privileges were solemnly renewed April 23 of this year, and the earlier authorization of independent voyages was officially

<sup>1</sup> Luigi Hugues, in the *Raccolta Colombiana* (6 parts in 14 vols., Rome, 1892-1896), Part V, vol. 2, 115.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 117.

<sup>3</sup> Vespucci's letter to Soderini, C. R. Markham, *Letters of Amerigo Vespucci* (Hakluyt Society, London, 1894), 3.

revoked June 2.<sup>1</sup> That these formal recognitions of Columbus's privileges should be flagrantly violated by the crown while the admiral was in Spain is hardly conceivable. It is, then, the accepted conclusion of very nearly all competent scholars that Vespucci's first voyage was made in 1499 with Hojeda. We have Hojeda's own statement under oath, in the Diego Columbus suit for his privileges, that Vespucci was with him,<sup>2</sup> and we also have sworn statements that Hojeda's was the first exploration of the northern coast of South America, which was the region visited by Vespucci in his first voyage.<sup>3</sup> Vespucci's narrative harmonizes in a number of minor details with what we know of the voyage of Hojeda.

The attempt was made by the Brazilian scholar Varnhagen, whose views are familiar to English readers from John Fiske's enthusiastic adoption of them,<sup>4</sup> to show that Vespucci's voyage was really directed to the coast of Honduras and the shores of the Gulf of Mexico. In the Latin translation of the Soderini letter describing the four voyages, the first is said to have been along the coast of Parias, the region where Columbus approached the continent of South America on his third voyage in 1498; while in the original Italian the name "Lariab" is given to the region, a name not elsewhere found. This is ordinarily explained as a misprint, but Varnhagen argued that it was correct and that it meant Honduras. This conjecture he based on the statements of the historians Gomara and Oviedo, who, writing, one a generation, the other two generations later, asserted that Vicente Yañez Pinzon discovered Honduras before the fourth voyage of Columbus.<sup>5</sup> The most probable year for this voyage of Pinzon Varnhagen thought to be 1497, which would harmonize then with Vespucci's narrative of an expedition in that year. But the historian Herrera states that Pinzon's voyage to Honduras was in 1506.<sup>6</sup> This assertion Mr. Fiske tried to break down by characterizing it as "the single unsupported statement of Antonio de Herrera, whose great work was published in 1601". Unfortunately for this argument, Herrera copied this assertion from Las Casas, who was a contemporary and who was living in the

<sup>1</sup> Navarrete, *Coleccion de los Viajes y Descubrimientos* (5 vols., Madrid, 1825-1837), II, 214, 219.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 544; in English, in Markham, *Letters*, 30.

<sup>3</sup> Hojeda's testimony is in note 5; see also Navarrete, III, 558, 586, 590. The testimony on 558 is in Markham, *Letters*, 109.

<sup>4</sup> Varnhagen's view is also presented by Thacher, *The Continent of America* (New York, 1896), and by Gaffarel, *Histoire de la Découverte de l'Amérique* (2 vols., Paris, 1892), II, 163.

<sup>5</sup> See Fiske, *Discovery of America*, II, 70.

<sup>6</sup> *Historia*, dec. I, lib. vi, ch. xvii; the passage is given in Fiske, II, 66.

Indies at the time. Las Casas does not give the year, but explicitly asserts that Pinzon's voyage was undertaken when the news came of what Columbus had discovered on his fourth voyage.<sup>1</sup> Not less explicit is the assertion of Ferdinand Columbus that the voyage of Pinzon and Solis took place in 1508.<sup>2</sup> Still again, Peter Martyr dates the voyage the year before that of Nicuesa (1509).<sup>3</sup>

In view, then, of the restoration of Columbus's monopoly privileges, of the absence of any recorded voyage in 1497, and of the evidence that the Pinzon-Solis voyage occurred later than 1504, the conclusion is well-nigh as positive and confident as it is almost universally accepted to-day that Vespucci made no voyage in 1497 such as he ascribes to himself, and that consequently he was not the first discoverer of the mainland of South America as he appeared to be from the widely circulated Latin edition of the Soderini letter, nor of the coast of Honduras as was first suggested by Varnhagen not forty years ago.

Vespucci's first voyage, then, was made in 1499 under Hojeda. His second, so far as can be ascertained, was made immediately upon his return from the first (it being supposed that he did not tarry in Española, as did Hojeda) with Diego de Lepe in 1500, when the westward trend of the coast of South America below eight degrees south latitude was discovered.<sup>4</sup> Vespucci's third voyage was made with a Portuguese captain in 1501, who was despatched to explore the lands just discovered by Cabral. This expedition ran down the coast of Brazil to the thirty-second degree parallel, then veered off through the south Atlantic until the fifty-second degree was reached, the highest southern latitude attained up to this time.<sup>5</sup> After a fierce storm, land was discovered, which is identified with the island of South Georgia. Vespucci's fourth voyage in 1503 was undertaken with "the intention of discovering an island in the East called Melaccha, of which it was reported that it was very rich, and that it was the mart of all the ships that navigate the Gangetic and Indian Seas".<sup>6</sup> This project of the king of Portugal was based on the reports brought back by Cabral from Calicut in 1501. It was, therefore, a renewed effort to carry out the original design of Columbus, which was not destined to be actually accomplished until the time of Magellan. The details of the history of this expedition corre-

<sup>1</sup> Las Casas, *Historia de las Indias* (5 vols., Madrid, 1875-1876), III, 200, 201.

<sup>2</sup> *Historie*, 290 (ch. 89 in original edition).

<sup>3</sup> *De rebus oceanicis et novo orbe*, dec. II, ch. vii (p. 181 of the edition of 1574).

<sup>4</sup> Hugues, *Cronologia delle Scoperte e delle Esplorazioni Geografiche* (Milan, 1903), 7.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>6</sup> Markham, *Letters*, 52-53.



spond to what the historian Goes tells us of the voyage of Coelho, who went over in part the same ground as that of 1501, without however, going beyond sixteen degrees south latitude.<sup>1</sup>

Of neither of these voyages was Vespucci the initiator, but according to his own account the first expedition on the return was intrusted to his command and in the second he was a captain. His name, however, is not to be found in the contemporary Portuguese histories nor in the vast mass of documents in the archives of Portugal relating to the discoveries.<sup>2</sup> If his two private letters to friends had not been published in Latin, instead of having the New World called after him, his name would have been known to us only as that of a map-maker and as the official examiner of pilots in Spain.<sup>3</sup>

Turning now to the products of his pen which wrought the seeming miracle, those whose authenticity is accepted consist first of a letter written to Lorenzo Piero Francesco de' Medici from Lisbon, in March or April, 1503, describing his third voyage, 1501, and a longer letter written also from Lisbon, in September, 1504, to his old school friend Pietro Soderini, of Florence, at that time gonfaloniere of the republic. This letter describes all four of the voyages. The original of the first or Medici letter is lost, but it was translated into Latin and published late in 1503 or early in 1504 under the title "Mundus Novus".<sup>4</sup> The longer letter to Soderini was published at Florence in 1505. It dropped out of sight, and only five copies are known to be extant. A French version of it, prepared for René II, duke of Lorraine, was translated into Latin and published in 1507 as an appendix to the *Cosmographie Introductio* of Martin Waldseemüller, a professor of geography in the College of Saint Dié, in Lorraine.

These letters are full of details of the strange aspects of nature and of man in the new regions. They have a confidential and personal note, perhaps not unnatural in a private correspondence, which at times rises from self-importance to self-exaltation. In variety of matter they surpass Columbus's letters about his first voyage and relate of course to a different field of exploration. In considering their extraordinary popularity, it is to be remembered that Columbus's own account of his third voyage, when he discovered the mainland of South America, was not printed till the nineteenth century; nor was any description of it printed until 1504 when one appeared in the little Venetian collection of voyages entitled *Libretto de Tutta*

<sup>1</sup> Hugues, *Cronologia*, 12. Yet cf. Markham, *Letters*, introduction, xliii.

<sup>2</sup> Santarem, in Navarrete, III, 310; also Santarem, *Researches* (Boston, 1850), 13.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the documents. Navarrete, *Viages*, III, 291-309.

<sup>4</sup> Quaritch, *The First Four Voyages of Amerigo Vespucci* (London, 1893), v.

*la Navigazione de Re de Spagna de le Isole et Terreni Novamente Trovati*, translated from the manuscript of Peter Martyr's unpublished *Oceani Decas*. The matter in this Libretto was taken over into the *Paesi Novamente Retrovati*, a larger collection published in 1507, and Peter Martyr published his *Oceani Decas* (Decade of the Ocean) in 1511.

If it is now remembered that Vespucci dated his first voyage 1497, and that his account of it was presented to the Latin-reading world in 1507, while Peter Martyr's brief account of Columbus's voyage of 1498 did not get before the Latin-reading world till 1508, in the Latin translation of the *Paesi Novamente Retrovati*, it is perfectly clear why the fame of Vespucci as the discoverer of continental South America eclipsed that of Columbus. Nor must it be forgotten that the Latin translation of the Medici letter descriptive of equatorial South America was being read all over Europe from 1503 on, for it is to this narrative more than to the other that the greatness of Vespucci's reputation was owing. An enumeration of the number of editions which were published within the next few years will illustrate this fact. There appeared in rapid succession fifteen editions of the Latin translation, seven editions in German, and one in Flemish.<sup>1</sup> Down to 1550 forty editions of this Medici letter have been recorded.<sup>2</sup> Less numerous were the Latin editions of the Soderini letter describing all four voyages, yet as they were appended to small treatises or text-books on geography their influence on the rising generation was most marked.

Outside of Spain Vespucci decidedly eclipsed Columbus. In the peninsula the case was different. The people among whom he lived and on whose ships he sailed knew little or nothing of him. No Portuguese translation of his letters was published until 1812 and no Spanish one until 1829. Peter Martyr just mentions his Brazilian voyages; Oviedo knows him not. Las Casas regards him as an impostor and his view is echoed by Herrera. Hardly less severe are the moderns Muñoz and Navarrete. In Portugal, Goes, Barros, and Osorio pass him in silence, and in the nineteenth century Santarem devoted a book to exposing his pretensions.

The enormous circulation of the Medici letter under the title *Novus Mundus*, etc., familiarized the European public outside of Spain with the association of Vespucci's name with the New World. Impressive, too, was his apparently clear conviction that it was a new part of the world and not simply the East Indies that had been

<sup>1</sup> See Fumagalli's bibliography in Uzielli's edition of Bandini, *Vita di Amerigo Vespucci* (Florence, 1898).

<sup>2</sup> Hugues, in *Raccolta Colombiana*, Part V, vol. 2, 139.

found. In the very first lines he says the regions which "we found and which may be called a new world (*novus mundus*), since our ancestors had no knowledge of them, and the matter is most novel to all who hear of it. For it goes beyond the ideas of our ancients, most of whom said there was no continent below the equator and toward the south, or if any of them said there was one they declared it must be uninhabited for many reasons. But that this opinion is false and altogether contrary to the truth this last voyage of mine has made clear."<sup>1</sup> Here was a positive, clean-cut declaration of the most striking character, very different from Columbus's enthusiastic but not altogether convincing identifications in his first letter of Cipango and Cathay.

Yet that it was really in any sense original with Vespucci may be questioned. In the first place, the Portuguese had proved, thirty odd years earlier, that equatorial Africa was both habitable and inhabited.<sup>2</sup> Secondly, the letter of Columbus to Ferdinand and Isabella, describing his third voyage, on which he discovered the mainland of South America, was shown to Hojeda and inspired his voyage of 1499,<sup>3</sup> on which he was accompanied by Vespucci. That Vespucci was also familiar with the contents of the letter is altogether probable, particularly if he went on the voyage, as is supposed, as a government agent. In this letter Columbus said of the mainland: "Of this half part [of the world] Ptolemy had no knowledge"<sup>4</sup>; "if this river does not flow from the earthly paradise it comes and flows from a boundless land to the south of which hitherto there has been no knowledge"<sup>5</sup>; "now when your highnesses have here [*i. e.*, across the Atlantic] another world (*otro mundo*)". In the letter to the nurse of Prince Juan, Columbus wrote of his third voyage: "I undertook a new voyage to the new heaven and new world (*nuevo cielo é mundo*), which up to that time was concealed"<sup>6</sup>; and again, "where by the divine will I have put under the dominion of the king and queen, our lords, another world".<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Varnhagen, *Amerigo Vespucci* (Lima, 1865), 13; Markham, *Letters*, 42.

<sup>2</sup> Opposite d'Ailly's assertion in his *Imago Mundi* that the torrid zone "is uninhabitable on account of excessive heat", Columbus had written in the margin at least a dozen years before: "It is not uninhabitable, because the Portuguese sail through it nowadays, and it is, indeed, very thickly inhabited; and under the equator is the king of Portugal's Castle of Mine, which we have seen." *Raccolta Colombiana*, Part II, vol. 2, 375.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, p. 42.

<sup>4</sup> R. H. Major, *Select Letters of Columbus* (2d ed., London, Hakluyt Society, 1870), 136.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 147.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 148.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 154.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 170.

Further indication that this use of the name *Novus Mundus* did not originate with Vespucci is afforded by one of the sketch-maps prepared by Bartholomew Columbus in 1503, when on the fourth voyage, in which the land south of the *Mar de Caribi* is called "Mondo Novo".<sup>1</sup>

Some additional illustrations of the use and meaning of the terms "new world", "other world", "West Indies" may be given here in order to clear away in some measure the confusion in which the subject has been involved.<sup>2</sup> The name West Indies was originated by Columbus himself and was used by him for the first time in document xliii, article iv, of his *Book of Privileges*, written before 1502, in which he refers to "la calidad de las dichas Yndias occidentales a todo el mundo innotas" ("the character of the said West Indies unknown to all the world").<sup>3</sup>

As for the term New World, in one or another of its Latin equivalents it was used from the beginning by Peter Martyr to describe Columbus's discoveries. In reality it did not mean a region detached at all points from the hitherto known world, but a new part of the globe not hitherto within the range of European knowledge. The use of it, therefore, implies of necessity nothing as to the physical connection or disconnection with Asia, but simply the fact of situation outside the bounds of previous knowledge, just as we say figuratively of a man in unfamiliar surroundings, "he found himself in a new world". Thus the Venetian Cada Mosto, writing of his voyages down the hitherto unexplored coast of Africa in 1455 and 1456, says the regions he saw in comparison with Europe might well be called "un altro Mondo" ("another world").<sup>4</sup> Similarly, after the name had become familiar as applied to South America, Francis Serrão, in writing to Magellan of the Moluccas, refers to them as farther than the antipodes and as being "another new world" ("outro novo mundo").<sup>5</sup>

Peter Martyr uses the phrase "western antipodes" in his letter of May 14, 1493; "new hemisphere of the earth" in that of September 13, 1493; he calls Columbus "that discoverer of new world" ("ille novi orbis repertor") November 1, 1493; he writes of more wonders from the "New World" ("orbe novo") October 20, 1494;

<sup>1</sup> Carlo Errera, *L'epoca della grandi scoperte geografiche* (Milan, 1902), 297. This map is reproduced in Channing, *Students' History of the United States* (New York, 1898), 32.

<sup>2</sup> E. g., in Fiske, *Discovery of America*, I, 444, note, and 515; II, *passim*.

<sup>3</sup> Spotorno, *Codice Diplomatico Colombo-Americano* (Genoa, 1823), 286; *Memorials of Columbus*, (London, 1823), 215; Thacher, *Columbus*, II, 530.

<sup>4</sup> Humboldt, *Kritische Untersuchungen* (3 vols., Berlin, 1836-1852), III, 130, note.

<sup>5</sup> Barros, *Da Asia* (24 vols., Lisbon, 1778-1788), dec. III, liv. v, ch. viii.

and in December of the same year he uses the phrase "Western Hemisphere" ("ab occidente hemisperio").<sup>1</sup> The Florentine Simone del Verde, in January, 1499, in a letter from Cadiz, remarks that the admiral had had great courage and genius in having discovered the other world opposite our own ("l'altro mondo opposto al nostro").<sup>2</sup> That Vespucci's letters first gave wide publicity to the discovery of a continental region south of the West Indies islands is undeniable, but that he was the first to recognize this discovery as such is not true. In fact, his conviction may have been simply the fruit of the seed planted by Columbus.

That Columbus believed at the same time that he had found islands lying off the eastern coast of Asia, and also a mainland to the south of these islands unknown to the ancients, presents no difficulty, but rather offers a solution of old-standing perplexities. Many writers have insisted that Columbus died in ignorance of his real achievement, believing that he had discovered the islands off the coast of Asia and part of the mainland of that continent. Others with equal confidence maintain that he realized that he had discovered a new world. His own language supports both views, and his position and that of his contemporaries becomes intelligible enough in the light of the interpretation given above of the phrase "new world", if we once realize the striking analogy between the relation of Australia to the Malay peninsula and that of South America to the parts of North America that Columbus visited. To take an illustration from a map published after Columbus's death and after the publication of Vespucci's voyages, in Ruysch's map in the *Ptolemy* of 1508 Florida occupies the position of Borneo, Española that of New Guinea, and Mundus Novus that of Australia.<sup>3</sup> In other words, if America and the Pacific had not existed and Columbus had done just exactly what he supposed he did, he would have discovered Borneo, New Guinea, and Australia, and these regions would have been called "another world", and Australia, *par excellence*, "Mundus Novus". It was only after Magellan's voyage across the Pacific that antagonism appears between Columbus's different descriptions. He did not and could not, nor could any one else, divine that vast expanse of waters.

Returning now to the history of the narrative of Vespucci's voy-

<sup>1</sup> All these will be found in Thacher's extracts from Peter Martyr, *Opus Epistolarum*, in his *Christopher Columbus*, I, 53 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Harisse, *Christophe Colomb* (2 vols., Paris, 1884-1885), II, 97; Thacher, I, 63.

<sup>3</sup> Sketches of Ruysch's map are given in Fiske, II, 114; Winsor, *Columbus*, 532, and *Narrative and Critical History*, II, 115. A comparison by means of any Mercator projection will make clear the points made in the text.

ages, with its widely-published announcement of a hitherto unknown southern continental region, we come to the first suggestion to attach the Florentine's name to this "Mundus Novus". Martin Waldseemüller, the young professor of geography at the college in Saint Dié, who published the Soderini letter or narrative of the four voyages as an appendix to his *Cosmographiae Introductio*, 1507, when he enumerated the different parts of the world, wrote: "In sexto climate Antarcticum versus, et pars extrema Africæ nuper reperta, et Zamzibar, Java minor et Scula insulæ, et quarta orbis pars (quam quia Americus invenit Amerigen, quasi Americi terram, sive Americam nuncupare licet) sitæ sunt." ("In the sixth climate toward the south pole are situated both the farthest part of Africa recently discovered, and Zanzibar, the islands of lesser Java and Ceylon, and the fourth part of the globe which since Americus discovered it may be called Amerige—i. e., Americ's land or America.")<sup>1</sup>

A little further on, when ready to take up the parts of the world unknown to the ancients, he opens his account: "Nunc vero et hæ partes sunt latius lustratæ et alia quarta pars per Americum Vesputium (ut in sequentibus audietur) inventa est, quam non video cur quis jure vetet ab Americo inventore, sagacis ingenii viro Amerigen quasi Americi terram, sive Americam dicendam: cum et Europa et Asia a mulieribus sua sortita sint nomina." ("Now, indeed, as these regions are more widely explored, and another fourth part has been discovered by Americus Vesputius, as may be learned from the following letters, I do not see why any one may justly forbid it to be named Amerige—that is, Americ's Land, from Americus, the discoverer, a man of sagacious mind, or America, since both Europe and Asia derived their names from women.")<sup>2</sup>

It will be noted that this young scholar, who in the prevailing fashion of the Renaissance had dignified his cumbersome family name of Waldseemüller into the Greco-Latin compound Hylacomylus (Gr. ὕλη, a wood; Lat. *lacus*, lake; Gr. *μύλος*, mill), which effectually concealed his identity in later days until it was revealed by Humboldt, pursued a similar process in devising the first of the two names which he proposed for the New World. Amerige is made up of Ameri(ci) and *ge*, the Greek γῆ, land. As an alternative the feminine of Americus is suggested by analogy with Asia, Europa, and Africa. As between Amerige and America euphony soon gave the palm to America, and only a writer here and there adopted the

<sup>1</sup> Fol. 3b., cited from Kretschmer, *Die Entdeckung Amerika's* (Berlin, 1892), 364.

<sup>2</sup> Fol. 15b., cited from Kretschmer, 364.



former.<sup>1</sup> The same advantage and the apt analogy in form to Asia and Africa, effectively and indispensably seconded by the rapid multiplication of geographies and maps in Germany, soon gave America the lead over all its competitors, in spite of the recurring sense of the injustice done to the memory of Columbus.

From the time of Schöner, who first made the charge in his *Opusculum Geographicum*, 1533, to the time of Humboldt, who completely refuted it, the belief was not uncommon that Vespucci had a hand in giving his own name to the New World. An interesting side-light on this point is thrown by the fact that his nephew Giovanni Vespucci did not adopt the name in the map he made in 1523.<sup>2</sup> Waldseemüller himself, when he became more thoroughly acquainted with the real history of the first discoveries, quietly dropped the name, and on his map of 1513 substituted for it on the mainland of South America "Terra Incognita", with the inscription, "This land, with the adjacent islands, was discovered by Columbus, a Genoese, under the authority of the King of Castile."<sup>3</sup>

The name America, notwithstanding the activity of the German press, made little or no headway in the Spanish peninsula, where "The Indies" was the prevalent official name and the one used by historians like Oviedo, Las Casas, and Herrera. The first Spanish maps to contain the name America were those in the *Atlas* of Lopez, Madrid, 1758.<sup>4</sup> Muñoz, in 1793, entitled his work, which was the first really critical history according to modern ideas, *Historia del Nuevo Mundo*. Among the other names suggested some may be noted. "Atlantis" was proposed by the French geographer Postel, 1561, and his example was followed among others by Sanson, 1689.<sup>5</sup> Ortelius, (Oertel), in 1571, desiring to do equal honor to Columbus and Vespucci, proposed to call North America "Columbana" and the southern continent "America". On Mercator's globe of 1541 the

<sup>1</sup> E. g., Nicolini de Sabio, in his edition of the *Cosmographie Introductio* (Venice, 1535); Marcou, *Nouvelles Recherches* (Paris, 1888), 44. The true derivation of the name *Amerige* was first explicitly given by the present writer in the *Political Science Quarterly* for March, 1893 (VIII, 166). Schöner did not recognize it, for he takes the accusative case *Amerigem* for the name, *Luculentissima Descriptio*, 1515, c. xi, fol. 60. Curiously enough, even Kretschmer does the same in his *Entdeckung Amerika's*, 364. Marcou thought it a variant of Amerigo, *Nouvelles Recherches*, 44. *Amerigem* is also found in Stobnicza's *Introductio in Ptholomei Cosmographiam* (Cracow, 1512, Fumagalli's bibliography, No. 46, in Uzielli's edition of Bandini, *Vita*). America, too, puzzled some writers, being taken for an adjective, so that the full name would be *America Terra*. Letter of Aucuparius to Frisius (Fumagalli, No. 64), or *America Provincia*, as Apian's map of 1520 (Kretschmer, 366; Hugues, *Le Vicende del Nome "America"* (Turin, 1898), 26.

<sup>2</sup> Hugues, *ibid.*, 29.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 18. See *Atlas zu Kretschmer, Entdeckung Amerika's*, plate 12.

<sup>4</sup> Hugues, *op. cit.*, 43.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 23.



name America is stretched over the hemisphere, "Ame" being inscribed on the northern and "rica" on the southern continent. The names North America and South America first appear on the maps early in the seventeenth century, in Magini's *Ptolemy* and Hondius's *Atlas*, 1609.<sup>1</sup>

The first indignant protest against the injustice done to Columbus in the application of another's name to the New World which he discovered was that of the celebrated Michael Servetus in that edition of *Ptolemy* (1535) whose unfortunate disagreement with the books of Moses as to the fertility of Palestine was one of the charges the stern Calvin brought against his victim.<sup>2</sup> Servetus declared that those were entirely mistaken who claimed that this continent should be called America, for Americus went thither much later than Columbus.<sup>3</sup> The case was taken up vigorously by Las Casas, who, as a friend and admirer of the admiral, felt deeply on the subject.<sup>4</sup> Curiously enough, there is no reference to the matter in Ferdinand Columbus's life of his father, which was written before 1539, and probably after the protest of Servetus. It would seem as if he died in ignorance of the eclipse of his father's fame by that of Vespucci in Europe outside of Spain.

The four discoverers—Columbus, John and Sebastian Cabot, and Amerigo Vespucci—have fared variously at the hands of modern historical criticism. John Cabot has been raised from almost complete obscurity to become a conspicuous but still shadowy figure. Sebastian Cabot has been pulled down from the lofty pedestal which he apparently erected for himself, his veracity is impugned, his scientific attainments disputed, and his lack of filial piety exposed to a glaring light. Around Vespucci the storms of controversy have raged for three centuries and a half, and he has suffered from them like Sebastian Cabot. His claims for himself have not stood the test. While he has been cleared of complicity in having his name attached to the New World, it is generally accepted that he antedated his first voyage to secure a distinction which did not belong to him and that his narratives unduly exalt himself at the expense of others equally entitled to honor. The position of Columbus alone has not been materially affected by the modern scrutiny into his career. Opinion has differed about his character, but the record of his achievements has been unshaken and the estimate of its significance has risen rather than fallen.

EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, 39.

<sup>2</sup> Humboldt, *Kritische Untersuchungen*, II, 323.

<sup>3</sup> The passage is quoted in Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History*, II, 176, note 10.

<sup>4</sup> Las Casas's extensive criticism of Vespucci's narratives is given in English in Markham, *Letters*, 68-108.

## NOVA SCOTIA AND NEW ENGLAND DURING THE REVOLUTION

At the beginning of the American Revolution it was not a foregone conclusion that Nova Scotia would continue loyal to the crown of England and that the other British colonies on the continent would all become independent. Yet writers dealing with the period frequently assume that Nova Scotia was from the first in a class altogether distinct from that of the revolting colonies, and therefore do not think her exceptional course of action worthy of remark. For instance, Green<sup>1</sup> says that all the colonies "adopted the cause of Massachusetts; and all their Legislatures, save that of Georgia, sent delegates to a Congress which assembled on the 4th of September at Philadelphia". In this statement Nova Scotia is altogether ignored. But, had this province made a fourteenth state in the Union, there is little doubt that the difficulty of England's holding Canada, especially during the season when the St. Lawrence was frozen, would have been enormously increased; and it is probable that England, like her rival France, would have been driven out of America. The attitude of Nova Scotia during the contest has therefore more than a merely local interest.

At first sight it is difficult to understand why Nova Scotia did not follow the lead of New England. The character of the population did not promise any high degree of loyalty. It was composed largely of emigrants from New England, who had only recently, at the time of the Stamp Act agitation, left their old homes; and there was another element of danger to the British connection in the presence of a number of Acadians who had escaped the intended doom of exile or had contrived to return to the province. In April, 1761, Belcher reported that there were 1,540 Acadians who had not yet submitted and who were fitting out armed vessels to prey on the trading ships. The hostility of the Acadians usually involved that of the Indians, who were still much under French influence. They

<sup>1</sup> *A Short History of the English People*, New York, 1877, 741.

<sup>2</sup> Belcher, chief-justice of Nova Scotia, to Lords of Trade, April 14, 1761, Manuscript Volume 37, no. 6, in Provincial Library, Halifax, Nova Scotia. Copies of this despatch and of most of those cited below are in the above-named library, which contains a valuable collection of documents relating to the early history of the province. Some of these are originals; others are transcripts from papers in the British Museum, the Massachusetts Public Records, etc.

numbered in 1764 about six hundred fighting men, a formidable force in a country of small and scattered settlements.<sup>1</sup>

It had been part of Lawrence's plan to settle some of the New England troops upon the fertile lands from which they had been employed to drive the Acadians, but these troops had not chosen to remain,<sup>2</sup> and it was not till the reduction of Louisburg in 1758 that the resettlement of the "vacated" French lands really began, for as long as the Acadians and Indians received encouragement from Cape Breton, new settlers entered the country with their lives in their hands. But within three months after the fall of the fortress Lawrence issued a proclamation<sup>3</sup> (with a description attached), inviting applications as well for the "lands vacated by the French as every other part of this valuable Province". He described in detail the unique advantages of the lands at his disposal—extensive forests, rich farms, already cleared, and navigable rivers falling into the Bay of Fundy. With special enthusiasm he dwelt on the fact that the new-comers would find their way prepared by the exiled Acadians, and that they might at once go in and possess fruitful orchards, fields stocked with English grass, and "interval plough-lands", upon which for a century the crops had never been known to fail. In another proclamation,<sup>4</sup> he promised liberty of conscience to all Protestant dissenters, assured them that they would not be required to give any support to the Church of England, and explained that the government and system of justice in Nova Scotia resembled that of Massachusetts.

The people of New England showed themselves very ready to go in and possess the lands of the unfortunate Acadians. Before the close of 1759, one hundred seven Massachusetts men had received grants in the township of Annapolis; nearly three hundred others of the same province had "signed" for lands in the townships of East Passage, Shoreham (on Mahone Bay), and Liverpool; and the township of Yarmouth had been allotted to a number of applicants, of whom nine or ten came from Philadelphia, and over a hundred from different parts of New England. This by no means ex-

<sup>1</sup> Wilmot, governor of Nova Scotia, to Lords of Trade, June 24, 1764, MS. Volume 39, no. 9. See also Douglas Brymner, *Report on Canadian Archives, 1894*, 255.

<sup>2</sup> Lords of Trade to Lieutenant-governor Lawrence, July 8, 1756; see *Report on Canadian Archives, 1894*, 210. In a few cases, as above, when I have not had access to the document in question, I have made use of the abstracts, in many instances very full, in the above report.

<sup>3</sup> Council Book, III, MS. Volume 211, 27, 28. This is a copy of the minutes of the meetings of the governor of Nova Scotia and his council. The original minutes are in the Provincial Library at Halifax, but the references here are always to the copy.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.

<sup>5</sup> Papers connected with Settlement of old Townships, Nova Scotia Provincial Library, MS. Volume 359.

hausts the list of immigrants. In September of this year, Lawrence stated<sup>1</sup> that the total number of families to be settled before the close of 1762 was 2,550, or about 12,250 souls. But it appears that, in a number of cases, the grantees never actually took possession of their lands, for in 1766,<sup>2</sup> counting the former inhabitants with the newcomers, there were in Nova Scotia only 2,375 families, or 9,789 persons, including what is now the province of New Brunswick. If we may assume the correctness of Chief-justice Belcher's estimate of 3,000 as the number of English inhabitants in Nova Scotia in 1755, it will be seen that the increase was by no means inconsiderable; and had Lawrence been permitted to manage matters as he thought best, it might have been much greater than it was.<sup>4</sup>

The glimpses we obtain of the New England settlers give the impression of an energetic, self-reliant people, jealous, like their compatriots, of any encroachment on their liberty. In June, 1760, the first settlers arrived at Liverpool, N. S., with live stock and thirteen fishing-schooners. Some of the party immediately betook themselves to the Banks to fish, while the rest set up three sawmills, and began to build houses for their families. Both Lawrence<sup>5</sup> and Belcher reported that the settlements at Horton, Cornwallis, and Falmouth were prospering, but by the end of 1761 Belcher complained of the exorbitant price demanded by the New-Englanders for their labor.<sup>6</sup> He said that, while the Irish were willing to work "in common labour" for two shillings per day, the New-Englanders would not work for less than four.

Of all the new settlers, the people of Liverpool<sup>7</sup> seem to have been most imbued with the spirit of their Boston brethren. In the

<sup>1</sup> Lawrence to Lords of Trade, September 20, 1759 (enclosure), *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 218.

<sup>2</sup> Abstract of number of inhabitants, etc., December 31, 1766, MS. Volume 43, paper 15.

<sup>3</sup> Belcher's opinion on removal of Acadians, of July 28, 1755, *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 206.

<sup>4</sup> He was informed by a letter from the Lords of Trade, dated August 1, 1759, that his duty with respect to the lands was simply to receive and transmit proposals. See *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 218; Council Book, III, MS. Volume 211, 95, 96. About this same time there were extensive schemes on foot to bring colonists from the other American colonies and from Ireland, but complaints were made that difficulties were thrown in the way of those bringing out settlers. See Memorial of Colonel Alexander McNutt, April 17, 1766, MS. Volume 31, no. 53. Several hundred from the north of Ireland were in fact brought over. See Lords of Trade to King, April 8, 1762, *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 232.

<sup>5</sup> Lawrence to Lords of Trade, June 16, 1760, MS. Volume 36, no. 48. See also *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 221.

<sup>6</sup> Belcher to Lords of Trade, November 3, 1761, MS. Volume 37, no. 11; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 228.

<sup>7</sup> Council Book, III, MS. Volume 211, 250.

minutes of the council of Nova Scotia, under date of July 24, 1762, is a remarkable document drawn up by the inhabitants of this little sea-coast town, which could then count scarcely more than two years from the day of its first settlement, insisting in no measured terms on their right to local self-government:

We, your memorialists, proprietors of the township of Liverpool, look upon ourselves to be freemen, and under the same constitution as the rest of His Majesty King George's other subjects, not only by His Majesty's Proclamation, but because we were born in a country of Liberty, in a land that belongs to the Crown of England, therefore we conceive we have right and authority invested in ourselves (or at least we pray we may) to nominate and appoint men among us to be our Committee and to do other offices that the Town may want. His present Excellency . . . and the Council of Halifax have thought proper to disrobe and deprive us of the above privilege, which we first enjoyed. This we imagine is encroaching on our Freedom and liberty and depriving us of a privilege that belongs to no body of people but ourselves, and whether the alteration and choice of the Men you have chosen to be our Committee is for the best or not we can't think so, and it has made great uneasiness among the people insomuch that some families have left the place and hindered others from coming, and we know some of the Committee is not hearty for the settlement of this place.

The petitioners complained that the said committee discouraged fishermen by saying that "they want farmers and that the township is full", but "we say, 'Encourage both'". "Therefore we pray", continued the memorial, "that we may have the privilege to chose our own Committee and other officers, as it will greatly pacify us and the rest of the people of the township, and what we must insist on as it belongs to us alone to rule ourselves as we think ourselves capable".

Liverpool was the only place in Nova Scotia to show "public marks of discontent" on the imposition of the stamp-duty.<sup>1</sup> Again, a little later,<sup>2</sup> this town was the scene of a riotous resistance to the law, as represented in the persons of the sheriff and deputy-sheriff of the county of Lunenburg. These officers had come to Liverpool in pursuit of a schooner that had been seized at New Dublin for some breach of the revenue laws and had escaped. Not seeing her in the harbor, they went into the town to make inquiries, but on the following night a mob of fifty men, armed with sticks and cutlasses, threatened the sheriff's life and forced him to sign a bond for 300l. "not to pursue the schooner any further".

Such manifestations of sympathy with persons engaged in illicit trade were a marked feature of the times in all the American colonies.

<sup>1</sup> Wilmut to Lords of Trade, November 19, 1765, MS. Volume 37, no. 46. See also *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 265.

<sup>2</sup> Council Book, IV, MS. Volume 212, 45.

With regard to restrictions on trade, Nova Scotia was of course in much the same position as New England. For instance, in the royal commission<sup>1</sup> to Governor Wilmot there is a clause forbidding him, on account of the complaints of London merchants, to assent to any bill by which the inhabitants of Nova Scotia would be put, in her own trade, on a more advantageous footing than those of England. Neither might he assent to bills laying duties on British shipping, products, or manufactures. The tender solicitude for British interests, to the exclusion of all others, went so far that the governor was forbidden to assent to the laying of import or export duties on negroes, which might tend to discourage British trade with Africa; nor might the province protect herself against undesirable immigration by laying any duty on the importation of felons from Great Britain. Wilmot was indeed commanded to suppress the "engrossing of commodities, as tending to the prejudice of that freedom, which Trade and Commerce ought to have, and to use his best endeavours in the improvement of the trade of those parts by settling such orders and regulations therein . . . as may be most acceptable to the generality of the inhabitants". But in the same clause the governor was forbidden, on pain of the king's highest displeasure, to "assent to any bill for setting up manufactures or carrying on trades", which might prove "hurtful and prejudicial" to England. Legge's commission,<sup>2</sup> dated 1773, is in many clauses identical with that of Wilmot. The clause concerning the slave-trade, and another requiring the governor to do his utmost to facilitate the conversion to Christianity of Indians and negroes, is the same.

In Nova Scotia there was, however, comparatively little reason for popular discontent with the navigation laws. There was practically no manufacturing in the province.<sup>3</sup> Two distillers of rum, a sugar baker, and two hatters constituted the list of manufacturers<sup>4</sup>. A little linen was sold by the Irish settlers, but there was good ground for hoping that such an objectionable practice would disappear when the people were more fully employed in the agricultural pursuits which became them. Lord William Campbell went so far as to ask permission to open and use the coal-mines of Cape Breton, and even ventured to issue licenses for the digging of coals. But though he said that the colliery could never interfere with England, his action

<sup>1</sup> Royal instructions, March 16, 1764, MS. Volume 349.

<sup>2</sup> MS. Volume 349.

<sup>3</sup> Michael Francklin to Shelburne, November 21, 1766, MS. Volume 42, no. 6.

<sup>4</sup> See also Francklin to Hillsborough, July 11, 1768, *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 287.

<sup>5</sup> Campbell to Shelburne, February 27, 1767, MS. Volume 43, no. 1. See also *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 276.



was condemned as irregular and the renewal of the licenses was forbidden.<sup>1</sup> Beyond the simple articles with which in a certain stage of social development every family supplies itself, there was little demand for manufactured goods. This being the case, Nova Scotia offered few attractions to any one whose bent was mechanical or commercial. Farmers might hope to reap abundant crops from the "vacated French lands". Fishermen might be drawn to the province by the number of "ports of safety",<sup>2</sup> and "the inexhaustible mines of fish", at the entrance to its harbors; but, as we have seen, for the would-be manufacturer there was nothing but discouragement, and as late as 1774<sup>3</sup> Governor Legge was able to report, "there is no other kind of business carried on in this colony than fishing and farming".

When the stamp-duties were under discussion, there was not a town in the province deserving of the name. In 1762<sup>4</sup> even Halifax had a population of only 2,500. Country people are proverbially slower to move and more difficult to rouse than the dwellers in towns, and the disaffected of Nova Scotia seem to have had no leader of any great power or influence. In Cumberland county and on the St. John river there were several men who appear to have had considerable local influence, which was exerted to the utmost on the side of the revolted colonies, but at Halifax, though from time to time persons were arrested on suspicion of holding correspondence with the rebels or for saying that they "thought the Americans were much in the right of it" <sup>5</sup> no one was charged with any serious attempt to organize resistance to government.

The interests of Halifax itself were indeed all on the side of the established order of things. Then as now it was the chief seaport, the seat of government for the province, and a British naval and military station, and in those days its prosperity, its importance, its very existence, depended on these conditions. Such specie as circulated was introduced into the country by the army and navy<sup>6</sup>

On the other hand, Halifax depended<sup>7</sup> upon New England for its

<sup>1</sup> Hillsborough to Franklin, February 26, 1768, MS. Volume 31, no. 69; *Report on Canadian Archives, 1894, 283.*

<sup>2</sup> Campbell to Shelburne, February 27, 1767, MS. Volume 43, no. 1; *Report on Canadian Archives, 1894, 276.*

<sup>3</sup> Legge to Dartmouth, July 6, 1774, MS. Volume 44, no. 37; *Report on Canadian Archives, 1894, 319.*

<sup>4</sup> Account of settlements enclosed with a letter of Belcher to Lords of Trade, January 11, 1762, MS. Volume 37, no. 13½; *Report on Canadian Archives, 1894, 230.*

<sup>5</sup> Papers relating to Crown Prosecutions, MS. Volume 342, paper 77.

<sup>6</sup> Campbell to Shelburne, September 7, 1767, MS. Volume 42, 20.

<sup>7</sup> Wilnot to Lords of Trade, June 24, 1764, MS. Volume 39, no. 9; *Report on Canadian Archives, 1894, 255.*



supplies of all fresh provisions except fish, and so, in the earlier years of the Revolution, was in constant communication with Boston, the chief center of disaffection. In Governor Lawrence's time even hay was brought from New England,<sup>1</sup> and in 1762 there was not in the town or its neighborhood one family that gained a living by husbandry. The only improved land consisted of a few garden lots and grass fields,<sup>2</sup> and the lack of roads prevented the country people from bringing in their produce. Campbell complained that it was frequently bought by New-Englanders, who sold it again to the people of Halifax.<sup>3</sup> From the first therefore the citizens were fully informed of all that went on in the colonies to the south.

To Nova Scotia, as to the other colonies, came the notice of the intended imposition of stamp-duties "towards defraying the necessary expenses of defending, protecting, and securing the British colonies and plantations in America".<sup>4</sup> The familiar story of the way in which this proposal was received does not need retelling. Nova Scotia alone, of all the colonies on the seaboard, submitted without "opposition or objection" to the laying on of the stamp-duties. In her settlements there were no riots, no non-importation agreements, and apparently, except from Liverpool,<sup>5</sup> no murmurs. The British ministers, however, saw no reason for greater confidence in the loyalty of Nova Scotia than in that of the more southern colonies; and, on hearing of the disturbances in Boston and other places, they instructed<sup>6</sup> Wilmot "if this evil should spread to the government of Nova Scotia", to use leniency and persuasion at first, but in the case of "acts of outrage and violence", to apply for assistance to the naval and military commanders.

Wilmot reported, however, that "the sentiments of a decent and dutiful acquiescence" prevailed "very powerfully" in Nova Scotia,<sup>7</sup> and in due time there came by express command of the king a letter<sup>8</sup> signifying "his highest approbation of the dutiful, loyal and discreet conduct, observed" in Nova Scotia "during the late unjustifiable transactions in other parts of America".

<sup>1</sup> Account of settlements with letter of Belcher, January 11, 1762, MS. Volume 37, no. 13½. See *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 230.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Campbell to Shelburne, May 21, 1767, MS. Volume 42, 15; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 277.

<sup>4</sup> Lord Halifax to Wilmot, August 11, 1764, MS. Volume 31, no. 38.

<sup>5</sup> Wilmot to Lords of Trade, November 19, 1765, MS. Volume 37, no. 46. See *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 265.

<sup>6</sup> Conway to Wilmot, October 24, 1765, MS. Volume 31, no. 50.

<sup>7</sup> Wilmot to Conway, February 17, 1766, MS. Volume 42, 5. See same to same, February 9, in *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 266.

<sup>8</sup> Richmond to Governor of Nova Scotia, June 12, 1766, MS. Volume 31, no. 57.

The Stamp Act was soon repealed, but the mischief it had done did not quickly pass away. It had provoked both the friends and the foes of America to investigate the status of the colonies in relation to the mother-country. Lord Mansfield on the one side, James Otis on the other, agreed in insisting that the distinction between port-duties and internal taxes was without foundation. This idea spread, and trade restrictions soon began to be regarded as worse than arbitrary taxation—"the more slavish thing of the two".

But the ministers were by no means prepared to give up the contest. At the moment of repealing the Stamp Act they took care to assert their rights over the colonies by "an Act for Securing the just Dependency of the Colonies on the Mother Country"; and the very announcement of the repeal of the measure that had proved so obnoxious was couched in language of irritating condescension.<sup>1</sup> One blunder followed another. Relief to the trade interests of America was promised, but little was given. The year 1767 saw another attempt of the British ministers to raise in America a revenue for military purposes by the imposition of taxes on tea and certain other articles. In many of the colonies this was met by a revival of the non-importation associations, and in February, 1768, the legislature of Massachusetts passed resolutions protesting against the new taxes, and adopted a circular letter to send to the other assemblies of North America.

This letter is interesting as an expression of the political creed of Massachusetts at that time, but its contents are too well-known to need repetition. We are concerned with it chiefly as an attempt to bring about concerted action on the part of the colonies, a matter which former experience had shown to be of extraordinary difficulty. The representatives of Massachusetts evidently dreaded giving offense to the assemblies of the sister colonies, and eagerly disclaimed any ambition of dictating to them or taking the lead. But they assumed throughout that these other assemblies were at one with them on the main points in dispute. They did not doubt apparently that even Nova Scotia would join in their protest. On the other hand, the

<sup>1</sup> Conway to Wilmot, March 31, 1766, MS. Volume 31, no. 52: "You will think it scarce possible, I imagine, that the paternal care of his Majesty for his colonies or the lenity and indulgence of the parliament should go further than I have already mentioned—yet so full of true magnanimity are the sentiments of both, and so free from the smallest colour of passion or prejudice that they seem disposed not only to forgive but to forget those most unjustifiable marks of an undutiful disposition, too frequent in the late transactions of the colonies. . . . A revision of the late American trade laws is going to be the immediate object of Parliament nor will the late transactions there, however provoking, prevent I dare say, the full operation of that kind indulgent disposition prevailing both in his Majesty and his Parliament to give to the trade interests of America, every relief which the true state of their circumstances demands or admits."

rulers of that province, from Hillsborough,<sup>1</sup> secretary of state, to Francklin,<sup>2</sup> the lieutenant-governor, expressed much confidence in the loyalty of Nova Scotia. At the same time they declared that the proceedings of Massachusetts were "of a most dangerous and factious tendency, calculated to inflame the minds" of the king's "good subjects in the colonies, to promote an unwarrantable combination, and to excite and encourage an open opposition to and denial of the authority of Parliament, and to subvert the true principles of the constitution".

Their faith in the "most noble and submissive obedience"<sup>3</sup> of Nova Scotia did not altogether allay their anxieties concerning the possible effect of the Massachusetts circular letter, even on that exemplary province; and Francklin was directed to prorogue or dissolve the assembly, if it betrayed any inclination to giving countenance to "this seditious paper". When the assembly of Nova Scotia met in the following June, however, Francklin<sup>4</sup> was able to report that the Massachusetts letter had not even been read, and that there would have been no difficulty in obtaining a strong vote of disapprobation, had it been thought necessary. "The people of this province", he repeats, "have the highest reverence and respect for all acts of the British legislature."

After the appearance of the circular letter, two regiments and four ships of war were ordered from Halifax to Boston. Campbell, who had just returned from a visit to England, wrote<sup>5</sup> to Hillsborough, urging that the troops might be sent back to Nova Scotia as quickly as possible, on account of the poverty of the people, "whose chief dependence was the circulating cash spent by the troops", and because of danger from Indians. The removal of the fifty-ninth regiment from Louisburg, he declares, will cause "a total

<sup>1</sup> Hillsborough to Governor of Nova Scotia, April 21, 1768, MS. Volume 31, no. 71: "The repeated proofs which have been given by the assembly of Nova Scotia, of their reverence and respect for the laws, and of their faithful attachment to the constitution leave little room in His Majesty's breast to doubt of their showing a proper resentment of this unjustifiable attempt to revive those distractions which have operated so fatally to the prejudice of this kingdom and the colonies."

<sup>2</sup> Francklin to Shelburne, March 29, 1768, MS. Volume 43, no. 25. *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 284. "No temptation, however great", he asserted, "will lead the inhabitants of this province to show the least inclination to oppose Acts of the British Parliament."

<sup>3</sup> Hillsborough to Governor of Nova Scotia, April 21, 1768, MS. Volume 31, no. 71.

<sup>4</sup> Campbell to Shelburne, February 27, 1767, MS. Volume 43, no. 1; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 276.

<sup>5</sup> Francklin to Hillsborough, July 10, 1768, MS. Volume 43, no. 34; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 287.

<sup>6</sup> Campbell to Hillsborough, September 12, 1768, MS. Volume 43, no. 49; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 290.

desertion" of the inhabitants; and the coal-mines, "peculiarly recommended from home not to be touched, may uninterruptedly be worked by any people who think proper to go there". Since the peace Louisbourg had been "the receptacle of adventurers in the Fishery"; so long as the troops were there the civil power could be enforced, but now there was reason to fear "total anarchy". The defense of Halifax, where a royal dockyard had lately been established, added to his anxieties. In case of war it would certainly be one of "the first objects of destruction",<sup>1</sup> for it might<sup>2</sup> "now be looked on as the northern key of His Majesty's American dominions".

Considering that he regarded the situation in Nova Scotia as so perilous, it is somewhat remarkable that Campbell permitted the publication of the inflammatory matter that appeared in the earlier numbers of *The Nova Scotia Chronicle and Weekly Advertiser*. Its first number appeared in January, 1769, and it kept its readers supplied with the "freshest advices" concerning the progress of events in the colonies to the south. Articles favorable to the king and his ministers occasionally found a place in its columns, but the general trend of the paper was, at this time, rather in favor of the champions of colonial rights. The question of war and of the separation of the colonies from Great Britain were freely discussed six years before the first shot was fired at Lexington, and the people were informed that great numbers of Englishmen looked "on America as in rebellion".<sup>3</sup>

Nova Scotia still refrained from joining in the loud protests of the New England colonies against taxation by the British Parliament, but even in that province were faint stirrings of the desire for larger liberty, and some of the townships ventured to call meetings<sup>4</sup> for debating questions relating to the laws and government. This alarmed the governor, and the attorney-general was instructed to threaten the offenders with prosecution. When the general assem-

<sup>1</sup> Campbell to Hillsborough, October 25, 1768, MS. Volume 43, no. 56; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 292.

<sup>2</sup> Same to same, January 13, 1769, MS. Volume 43, no. 67; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 294.

<sup>3</sup> The issue for July 11-18 contains a long protest from the *Gentleman's Magazine*, addressed "To the Writers against America", prophesying that if war should occur, "the consequence must be alike fatal to Britain, whether England or America is victorious". And the quarrel is "for what?" "For less than a shadow." In the issue for August 22-29, 1769, appeared an "Extract of a Letter from a Gentleman of distinction in London to his Friend in Boston", approving of the proceedings of that town: "I have learnt with pleasure from the papers that the Bostonians are firm and steady, not to be intimidated by the presence of a military power, and not afraid of enumerating their grievances."

<sup>4</sup> Council Book, IV, MS. Volume 212, 136.

bly met in June, however, Campbell was able to report<sup>1</sup> that he "did not discover in them any of that licentious principle with which the neighboring colonies are so highly infected".

In October, 1773, Lieutenant-colonel Legge became governor of Nova Scotia. He was at Halifax for about two years and a half, and he made himself so unpopular that his councilors complained of him to the authorities at home, the principal inhabitants of Nova Scotia petitioned for his recall, and Francklin described him as utterly unsuitable for the position of governor from "his capacity, temper, and disposition". Legge represented the inhabitants of Nova Scotia, including even the government officials, as disloyal. Francklin<sup>2</sup> asserted that the accusations were untrue, but that Legge's conduct had been "too oppressive, vindictive and ungracious"; and that he had "lost the confidence and affection of the King's best subjects". In fact the number of the disaffected had "been greatly augmented by his arbitrary and impolitic conduct". Legge's opinion that there was a considerable amount of disaffection in the province receives some corroboration from other sources. The provost marshal, Fenton,<sup>3</sup> complained that many of the members of the assembly were "emigrants from New England, who have brought the same principles as exist there, and are determined", being in the majority, "to give the Governor and all the officers under him all the uneasiness in their power".

To the resolutions of the Congress at Philadelphia, declaring for non-intercourse with colonies that did not accept its measures, Nova Scotia paid no attention.<sup>4</sup> But as a matter of fact the trade of Halifax was by this time seriously affected, and communication even with England was rendered difficult. In the winter of 1774-1775, when the harbor of Boston was closed by the Port Bill, only one small vessel which was accustomed to make two voyages in the year came from Great Britain to trade at Halifax.<sup>5</sup> Legge sapiently suggested<sup>6</sup> that the way to help the loyal colonies was to place fresh restrictions on commerce, and thus force the industrious New Eng-

<sup>1</sup> Campbell to Hillsborough, June 13, 1770, MS. Volume 43, no. 100.

<sup>2</sup> Francklin to Dartmouth, January 2, 1776, MS. Volume 45, no. 3; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 344. See also Council Book, IV, MS. Volume 212, 316, and Francklin to John Pownall, secretary of the Board of Trade and Plantations, May 4, 1776, MS. Volume 45; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 349.

<sup>3</sup> See Extract from Fenton's letter of November 18, 1774, *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 326.

<sup>4</sup> Legge to Dartmouth, March 6, 1775, MS. Volume 44, no. 59. See *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 328.

<sup>5</sup> Same to same, July 6, 1774, MS. Volume 44, no. 38; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 319.

<sup>6</sup> Same to same, March 6, 1775, MS. Volume 44, no. 59.

land fisherman to abandon smuggling and come to the coast of Nova Scotia to seek his living from the sea. Of the bill for restricting the fishermen of New England he had great hopes.<sup>1</sup>

At the beginning of the war there appears to have been some danger of Nova Scotia's being lost to England. The Americans made more than one attempt at invasion, though these were so feeble that they have no place in the shorter and more general accounts of the struggle.<sup>2</sup> Open invasion, however, was not their most dangerous mode of attack. They labored to stir up the Indians and persuade the settlers from New England to revolt, and they let loose a swarm of privateers to harry the coasts and destroy the fishing-boats and trading-vessels of the province. To make matters worse, reinforcements were sent to Gage, and Halifax was left almost defenseless.<sup>3</sup> To supplement his meager force, Legge set himself to raise a thousand men in Nova Scotia. With this number under his command, he said,<sup>4</sup> he could answer for the preservation of the province, though "the colonies to a man" were "prepossessed with great prejudice" against it. But he could place no reliance on the enthusiastic loyalty of the people. The Nova Scotians were not so eager as he expected to enlist in the "Royal Fencible Americans" as the regiment was to be called, and Legge soon decided that the militia were not to be depended on in the event of an attack from the eastern part of New England, as many of them came from there. There were moreover other evidences of disaffection. A quantity of hay purchased for the horses in Boston was burned, and a fire was discovered in the navy-yard. The two men, however, who were thought to be guilty of the act were declared by a resolution of the assembly to be "dutiful and loyal subjects of King George".<sup>5</sup>

Suspected disloyalty and the lack of troops were not the only alarming circumstances of which Legge had to take account in estimating his chances of defending Halifax in case of attack. The fortifications were in a dilapidated state; the batteries were dismantled, the gun-carriages decayed, the guns on the ground. In fact

<sup>1</sup> Legge to Dartmouth, April 24, 1775, MS. Volume 44, no. 61; *Report on Canadian Archives, 1894*, 329.

<sup>2</sup> See Bourinot *Story of Canada* (London, 1898); Edward Eggleston, *A History of the United States and its People* (New York, 1888); Goldwin Smith, *The United States* (New York, 1893).

<sup>3</sup> Legge to Dartmouth, July 31, 1775, MS. Volume 44, no. 71. See *Report on Canadian Archives, 1894*, 334, 335. Lengthy extracts from this letter and many others are printed in Beamish Murdoch's *History of Nova Scotia* (Halifax, 1866). See II, 550, 551.

<sup>4</sup> See advertisement in *Nova Scotia Gazette and Weekly Chronicle*, June 20, 1775. See also Murdoch's *History of Nova Scotia*, II, 539.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*



there were no defenses round the town, and it lay "open to the country on every side".<sup>1</sup> Provisions were scarce, partly through the effort to supply the royal troops at Boston, and partly through "the defection of the southern colonies",<sup>2</sup> upon which Halifax had been accustomed to depend for supplies. It was also difficult to obtain fuel, owing in a measure at least to the fact that persons bringing fuel to market were frequently pressed for the navy. The same cause interfered with the "provision of fish". In addition to his other duties he was now called on to care for the New England refugees, provide them with land, and furnish food to those in need.<sup>3</sup> Gage believed that some of these refugees from New England were tainted with disloyalty.

To meet this danger, all persons, "not settled inhabitants", who came into town were required to give notice to the magistrate on pain of being treated as spies, and all innkeepers were to give notice of the arrival of strangers, "on pain of the like penalty". It was also decided<sup>4</sup> that persons coming from the rebellious colonies, besides taking the ordinary oath of allegiance, must declare their submission to the king and the parliament, and their detestation of the proceedings of the rebels. The magistrates had by a proclamation been required "to apprehend all disloyal persons stirring up or making disturbances", and there seems to have been occasionally some harshness in the performance of this duty. For instance,<sup>5</sup> in June, 1775, the magistrates of Annapolis county "apprehended Mr. Howard, the dissenting teacher", though "he had not been guilty of any misdemeanour since his arrival in this Province, but had behaved himself discreetly, and as became a good subject". He was nevertheless brought to "town in the custody of the Provost Marshal" and was informed that "information had been given against him, from New England that he had at several times held forth seditious discourses tending to alienate the minds of the King's subjects". The governor had therefore thought it necessary that he should be warned against such behavior, "as he would avoid a commitment to prison and a prosecution at law", but on promising "a dutiful, loyal behaviour", he was allowed to depart.

During the latter part of this year, the rumors of an intended

<sup>1</sup> Legge to Dartmouth, August 19, 1775, MS. Volume 44, no. 76; *Report on Canadian Archives, 1894*, 336.

<sup>2</sup> See Council Book, IV, MS. Volume 212, 268.

<sup>3</sup> Dartmouth to Legge, July 1, 1775, MS. Volume 32, no. 31. See *Report on Canadian Archives, 1894*, 332.

<sup>4</sup> Legge to Dartmouth, December 22, 1775, MS. Volume 44, no. 86. See *Report on Canadian Archives, 1894*, 342.

<sup>5</sup> Council Book IV, MS. Volume 212, 254.



invasion of Nova Scotia kept the governor and his councilors in a condition of constant excitement and alarm. But in spite of their anxiety they found time for frequent quarrels among themselves and with the assembly. The governor wished to make certain changes in the constitution of that body.<sup>1</sup> The assembly hotly resented his proposals, telling him with characteristic freedom of language that "dictatorial powers may be necessary to quell insurrections, or to rule a disaffected people, but where no such principles exist, the exertions of such powers will create them". The councilors in their turn declared that the assertions of the assembly were "illiberal, groundless", and could not be supported. All parties besieged the unfortunate secretary of state with charges and countercharges, and in due time came a message from the king that he was displeased with "the dissensions of the Provincial Governments over trivial matters".<sup>2</sup>

During these early years of the war, Halifax feared attack. There were rumors of expeditions against it that were disquieting,<sup>3</sup> for the place was quite without proper defenses, and to make them was a matter of difficulty. Men did not readily volunteer, and the measures adopted to fill the ranks were not successful.<sup>4</sup> There was moreover opposition to the taxes imposed for the support of the troops. The people were poor, and here, as in the other colonies, taxes were an unwelcome reminder of authority. A petition from Cumberland county shows that considerable democratic spirit was latent there:<sup>5</sup>

We must beg leave to say that it appears to ocular demonstration that those who voted for the said Bills were utterly unacquainted with the state of the Province. The law being intended for the safety of the inhabitants . . . they should have been consulted thereon. . . . The dispute arising between Great Britain and the colonies has no way reached this quarter, nor can we find any grounds of complaint, wherein any acts of violence have been committed or hostilities commenced in any part of this province, except the destroying the fort at St John's River, which appeared rather an act of inconsideration than otherwise, nor are we anyways apprehensive of any danger from them, except this Militia Bill is enforced. Those of us who belong to New England, being invited into the Province by Governor Lawrence's proclamation, it must be the greatest piece of cruelty and imposition for them to be subjected to march into different parts in arms against their friends and relations.

<sup>1</sup> See Council Book, IV, MS. Volume 212, 256-259.

<sup>2</sup> Suffolk to Legge, October 16, 1775; *Report on Canadian Archives, 1894*, 339.

<sup>3</sup> Council Book, IV, MS. Volume 212, 253, 272, 273, 280.

<sup>4</sup> Council Book, IV, MS. Volume 212, 287, 296, 301. See also "Transcripts relating to the American Revolution from the Massachusetts Public Records", MS. Volume 364, paper 6.

<sup>5</sup> MS. Volume 364, paper 8.

. . . The impossibility of supporting troops in our present exigencies must be obvious to every judicious and impartial eye that beholds us. No medium of trade—not £ 150 cash circulating among us and that at the command of a few persons, no way to pay our debts, but in the way of barter, no commerce carried on with other parts, must consequently render it most calamitous and wretched, nay, it is a matter not to be doubted that the inhabitants cannot do it. [In conclusion they requested the governor] . . . to suspend putting the said Militia and tax Bill into execution, till a further deliberation . . . and to dissolve the present house of Assembly and issue precepts for a new choice.

Meanwhile there were other indications that the New England settlers in the province were far from being satisfied and that an effort to gather the militia might precipitate a conflict.<sup>1</sup> It is difficult to say how much reliance is to be placed on the testimony to this effect, but it seems to have determined the governor not to summon the militia,<sup>2</sup> and he was evidently unwilling to attempt disarming the disaffected. The attempt could not however have precipitated a very bloody struggle, since the disaffected were without ammunition<sup>3</sup> and the loyalists almost as destitute. But besides those suspected of downright disloyalty, there were some who were half-hearted in their support of the governor's authority, and desired to "remain neuter" in case of an attack on the province, which, throughout the winter of 1775<sup>4</sup> seemed a very real danger.

In the meantime the royal army had been forced to evacuate Boston, and had arrived at Halifax. This was of course a heavy blow to the king's cause, but the coming of the troops, and of the large number of loyalists who accompanied them, increased the strength of Nova Scotia relatively to that of the disaffected colonies. This, however, was not the beginning of the influx of refugees. During the previous year many loyalists had removed to Nova Scotia, and their coming had been encouraged, as has already been mentioned, by grants of land, and, in some cases, of provisions. The authorities appear to have been actuated by something like a settled policy of making Nova Scotia a center and stronghold of loyalty. Upon receiving Dartmouth's despatch respecting the treatment of refugees, Legge issued a proclamation to those likely to seek an asylum in Nova Scotia. This he endeavored to "spread on the Continent",<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Captain Stanton to Legge, December 4, 1775; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 34f.

<sup>2</sup> Council Book, IV, MS. Volume 212, 302; Legge to Dartmouth, January 11, 1776, *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 345.

<sup>3</sup> Legge to Dartmouth, December 22, 1775, MS. Volume 44, no. 86; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 342.

<sup>4</sup> See Council Book, IV, MS. Volume 212, 300.

<sup>5</sup> Legge to Dartmouth, October 17, 1775, MS. Volume 44, no. 78. See *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 339.

though, owing to the scarcity of provisions, he found great difficulty in supplying the promised rations. He entreated<sup>1</sup> that flour and pork and butter should be sent from the British Isles. In the meantime he proposed to make the loyalists an allowance in cash, so that they might supply themselves as best they could at the markets, where, however, the price of all food was doubled. In the spring of 1776, Legge reported<sup>2</sup> that the rebels were trying to prevent the loyalists from leaving New England for Nova Scotia, but stated in the same letter that he had been informed by Howe that two hundred families, many of them poor, would soon arrive at Halifax. In less than a month there came fifty transports<sup>3</sup> crowded with people from Boston who had remained faithful to their old allegiance. Their coming strained to the utmost the resources of the little town, though the governor and council did their utmost to prevent distress, issuing numerous regulations and proclamations.<sup>4</sup> They fixed the price of fresh meat at one shilling per pound (Halifax currency), of butter at one shilling six pence per pound, and of milk at six pence per quart. They also decreed that no one must charge more than double the ordinary rent for rooms or houses, and declared that the laws against regrating and forestalling would be strictly enforced. But, in spite of all regulations, the price of beef speedily rose<sup>5</sup> to two shillings and six pence per pound and that of butter to five shillings per pound, while people had to cook in the streets in cabooses from the ships. When Howe sailed with his army from Halifax on June 10, a vast number of women and children were left behind, to be provided for as cheaply as possible by General Massey, then in command of the garrison. With this object he hired a schooner, which he named the *Charity*, to supply the refugees and the invalids with fish. Before winter a number of the refugees, "frightened at the cold and the high price of provisions",<sup>6</sup> left Halifax, but many remained in the province. As we have seen, Legge had been impressed by the difficulties of his administration and had written constantly of disaffection and danger, which, no doubt, his own lack of judgment tended to increase. For his fears there

<sup>1</sup> Legge to Dartmouth, November 27, 1775, MS. Volume 44, no. 82. See *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 341.

<sup>2</sup> Legge to Dartmouth, March 18, 1776, MS. Volume 45, no. 9. See *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 348.

<sup>3</sup> Legge to Germain, April 10, 1776, MS. Volume 45, no. 10. See *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 349.

<sup>4</sup> Council Book, IV, MS. Volume 212, 315.

<sup>5</sup> See *Collections of the Nova Scotia Historical Society*, I (1878), 53, 54.

<sup>6</sup> Massey to Germain, June 27, 1776, MS. Volume 365, no. 13. See *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 351. See also Massey to Germain, October 6, 1776. *Ibid.*, 354.

appear to have been some reasons; for, though his successor, Lieutenant-governor Arbutnot, announced that all were "in perfect good humour" in the colony,<sup>1</sup> he also described the New-Englanders and Acadians as "bitter bad subjects". On the other hand, early in 1776 as many as five hundred men, including some from the free-spoken people of Cumberland county,<sup>2</sup> were enrolled in the militia, and the assembly that met in June voted a loyal address consecrating their lives and fortunes to the service of the king.

Of the threatened attacks upon Nova Scotia little need be said. Massachusetts was interested in attempts at invasion, but they were altogether unsuccessful. Throughout the war the authorities at Halifax were suspicious of the intentions of the New-Englanders on their borders, the more so, as there was difficulty in obtaining information of their movements. In the summer of 1779 a counter attack was made. An expedition swooped down from Halifax on Penobscot and took possession of the peninsula where Castine now is.<sup>3</sup> An effort to recover it was unsuccessful, and that region remained in the possession of the British till the end of the war.

Perhaps the Indians were the chief source of danger to the province, for effort was made by the agents both of New England and of Nova Scotia to gain or retain the friendship of the Micmacs and the St. John River Indians.

John Allan of Cumberland county, appointed in 1777 Indian agent for Massachusetts,<sup>4</sup> sought to win the friendship of the red men for the cause of the revolting colonies, but he met with little success. Governor Francklin succeeded in persuading the St. John Indians to give up to him a treaty that they had made with Massachusetts, in which they had promised to send six hundred men to join Washington's army, and he also induced them to swear "on the Holy Scriptures" to hold no communication with Machias, to follow their hunting and fishing quietly, and to warn the English of designs against their garrisons.<sup>5</sup> It was always Francklin's great object to keep the Indians quiet, for he feared that, once thoroughly roused, they might turn their arms against the English, and an Indian war, vigorously carried on, would cause the utmost confusion and dis-

<sup>1</sup> Arbutnot to Germain, undated, MS. Volume 45, no. 21; see also same to same, December 31, 1776, MS. Volume 45, no. 32, *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 358.

<sup>2</sup> Francklin to Pownall, May 4, 1776, MS. Volume 45, no. 15. See also *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 348.

<sup>3</sup> Hughes to Haldimand, June 20, 1779, *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1888, 567.

<sup>4</sup> Hughes to Germain, September 2, 1779, MS. Volume 45, no. 75; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 383.

<sup>5</sup> Journal of Allan, January 16, 1777, in MS. Volume 364, paper 96.

<sup>6</sup> Copy of oath taken by Indians September 24, 1778, and January 19, 1779, Dorchester Papers, Volume I, MS. Volume 368, 83.

tress. He was especially apprehensive of this when there were rumors that a French fleet was hovering on the coasts, for the attachment of the Indians to the French was still strong.<sup>1</sup>

But if upon the whole the interests of the province were safe on land, the little commerce it possessed was far from safe at sea. As early as November 30, 1775, it was reported that two New England schooners had captured twenty-two ships, and six months later the judges of the Supreme Court actually represented that it would be unsafe to hold the regular courts<sup>2</sup> in Cumberland, Annapolis, and King's counties because of the danger from "pirates" in the Bay of Fundy. The ground of this judicial timidity is not altogether clear, and it was eventually decided to hold the courts; but, though the seamen did not so far forget their trade as to attack the courts, nothing afloat seemed to be secure. "Rebel pirates", wrote the governor, "have entered our defenceless harbours indiscriminately from Cape Sable to very near this port, landed to the great terror of the well-affected people; cut out several vessels, and done much mischief".<sup>3</sup> At a later time it was reported by Hughes, the successor of Arbuthnot, that the "pirates" had stations to the east and west of Halifax, knew what ships came to the harbor, and lay on the watch for them.<sup>4</sup> Naturally the New-Englanders did not have everything their own way, for privateers were fitted out in Nova Scotia to prey upon such of the commerce of the enemy as might be found.<sup>5</sup>

This kind of warfare provoked much bitter feeling; and other causes were at work to diminish the sympathy that at first existed between Nova Scotia and New England. Chief among these was a kind of natural selection, which at once impelled the warmest advocates of colonial rights to leave a province where they were in the minority, and inclined the loyalists to seek a refuge where their political principles were still held in respect. When at last Great Britain gave up the contest, it was to Nova Scotia that thousands of the vanquished party turned in the hope of building up a new country under the flag and traditions of their forefathers. General Sir Guy Carleton was besieged with memorials and petitions from the loyalists, to which he seems<sup>6</sup> to have attended with patience and kindness.

<sup>1</sup> Franklin to Clinton, August 2, 1779, *Dorchester Papers*, Volume I, MS. Volume 368, 84-89.

<sup>2</sup> Council Book, IV, MS. Volume 212, 318.

<sup>3</sup> Arbuthnot to Germain, October 8, 1776, MS. Volume 45; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 354.

<sup>4</sup> Hughes to Germain, *ibid.*, undated, MS. Volume 45, 70.

<sup>5</sup> See Council Book, IV, October 14, 1779, MS. Volume 212, 372.

<sup>6</sup> See numerous letters and memorials in *Dorchester Military Papers*, II, MS. Volume 369.

Most of the refugees that went to Nova Scotia had collected at New York under the protection of the British army, but they came originally from all the different colonies. They were of all classes, from lawyers, clergymen, and merchants down to slaves. Usually a number of families and single men grouped themselves together in one party, and made application for lands, etc., through one or two men, acting as agents for the rest. In most cases the refugees were conveyed to Nova Scotia and were supplied with rations, tools, and other necessities at the expense of the British government.<sup>1</sup> In spite of this assistance, they suffered many and severe privations. At the close of the war, different parts of Nova Scotia and Canada saw a repetition of the scenes which had occurred at Halifax on the arrival of Howe's army. For instance, it is recorded<sup>2</sup> that in October, 1782, nine transports, escorted by two men-of-war, arrived at Annapolis with five hundred refugees. Others soon followed. Several hundred were stowed in the church, a building only sixty by forty feet, and the rent of small unfurnished rooms went up to three dollars per week. A little later there arrived at Halifax five hundred loyalists from Charleston, South Carolina, who, being ill-provided with both clothing and shelter, suffered pitiably from the cold.<sup>3</sup> Such instances might be multiplied indefinitely. By the summer of 1784, it was estimated<sup>4</sup> that 30,000 loyalists had settled in Nova Scotia. Their settlement was not effected without a good deal of friction and dissatisfaction,<sup>5</sup> but the letters of those in authority give the impression of an earnest desire to assist all who had suffered on account of their adherence to the royal cause, and by the end of 1784, Governor Parr was happily able to report<sup>6</sup> that the refugees were contented and getting on well.

Efforts had been made, both in Nova Scotia and in Canada, to settle them along the international boundary, so as to strengthen the British hold on the country in the event of difficulty with the

<sup>1</sup> North to the Governor of Nova Scotia, May 5, 1783, Dorchester Papers, II, MS. Volume 369, paper 181.

<sup>2</sup> See *Halifax Herald*, May 8, 1897, for an article quoting the "Journal of Jacob Bailey", which is now in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society. See also Parr to Townshend, October 26, 1782, MS. Volume 45, no. 116; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 401.

<sup>3</sup> Same to same, December 7, 1782, MS. Volume 45, no. 119. See also Parr to Nepean, January 22, 1782, *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 402.

<sup>4</sup> Parr to Sydney, August 13, 1784, MS. Volume 47, no. 27; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 423.

<sup>5</sup> Parr to Sydney, April 10, 1784, MS. Volume 47, no. 23; also letters quoted in *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 417-419.

<sup>6</sup> Parr to Sydney, December 27, 1784, and Parr to Nepean, January 2, 1785, *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 430.

new republic—a contingency which by the War of 1812 was unfortunately proved to merit consideration. But, apart from questions of defense, the importance to the British provinces of the settlement of the loyalists can hardly be overestimated. In fact, it may be doubted whether the present Dominion of Canada does not owe its very existence to these refugees. The necessity for keeping faith with those Americans who had fought and suffered for the royal cause probably prevented the British ministers from throwing away, at the close of the war, the despised remnants of England's dominion in America, till that time so extensive. Moreover, had they retained the French colony of Canada, then hardly resigned to British rule, and the one British colony of Nova Scotia, with its meager population of 14,000 souls, these provinces, without the loyalists, would not long have been able to resist absorption by the young nation to the south. But the coming of the refugees trebled the population of British descent, and the loyalists carried to their new homes sentiments and traditions of passionate attachment to monarchical institutions and to the British connection, which have borne fruit in the deep-rooted though less demonstrative loyalty of the modern Canadian.

EMILY P. WEAVER.

<sup>1</sup> See Morse's return, quoted in *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1894, 412.



## THE FIRST STAGE OF THE MOVEMENT FOR THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS

It is but a truism that the greatest value of history lies in the lesson, intellectual and moral, to be learned therefrom; and in all history there is perhaps no movement which is more profoundly instructive in both these aspects than the annexation of Texas. No clash of opposing political and social forces, no *mêlée* of antagonistic human impulses, within the record has given better opportunity to distinguish the wisdom of the ages from the imperious conviction of the moment. But it is unsafe to consider any historical question primarily from the didactic standpoint. In such case, as experience has shown, insight is too often dulled by belief, and investigation misled by prejudice. The first concern, therefore, of every student of history should be the fact: from that alone can the true lesson be obtained. In accordance with this principle, I shall give attention, within the limits assigned me, mainly to the actual happenings of the annexation movement, only now and then touching upon their deep significance.

The subject of this paper is best approached by a brief summary of the events which led to the movement under consideration. This movement was begun by Texas<sup>1</sup> and was, it seems to me, a natural result of the Anglo-American occupation of that country and of the revolution which separated it from Mexico.

The Anglo-American influx into Texas began while the western boundary of the expanding United States yet rested on the Mississippi. The Louisiana purchase made this line coterminous on the southwest with the northeastern limit of Mexico, but the common boundary was not determined till 1819, when, for the sake of Florida, whatever claims the United States may have had to Texas were definitely given up. The intruders, however, continued to cross the Sabine without permission until the eve of the revolution which made Mexico independent of Spain. From that time forward the movement changed its nature and took on a colonizing aspect. The Anglo-Americans were allowed to enter freely as immigrants, and inducements to come were offered them in the shape of liberal allotments of land. By 1830 the Mexican government had become uneasy concerning the growth of an essentially alien population in

<sup>1</sup> Of course the suggestion is much older than the movement. I have not undertaken to trace the beginnings of the idea.

Texas and issued a decree forbidding further immigration from the United States. Nevertheless the immigrants continued to come, in considerable numbers at least. Finally in 1835 occurred the inevitable clash, which resulted in the expulsion of the Mexicans in 1836 and the independence of Texas.<sup>1</sup>

The Texas revolution passed, in its development, through two states. In its first phase it was a struggle for the Mexican Constitution of 1824, in which Texas alone held out against the centralizing policy of Santa Anna after a similar resistance on the part of Zacatecas and Coahuila had been crushed by force. But after the colonists had definitely refused, in November, 1835, to claim independence, and after they had captured Cos's army at San Antonio and had cleared their soil of Mexican troops, it became evident that there was no hope of coöperation from the Liberals in Mexico, and that Texas must either submit or abandon the confederation. These alternatives had made themselves clear by January 1, 1836, and from that time forward the aim of the struggle was for independence.

Meanwhile a commission consisting of Stephen F. Austin, William H. Wharton, and Branch T. Archer had been sent to the United States to do Texas such service as it could. The principal work of the commissioners lay in stirring up public sentiment on behalf of the Texans and securing aid for them in men and money; but their letters indicate that they considered themselves instructed to negotiate for the recognition of the new republic, and, under certain contingencies, also for its annexation to the United States.

While the commissioners were in New Orleans in January, 1836, they prepared a design for a Texas flag, which was peculiarly suggestive of the importance they attached to the relations connected with the idea of annexation. It had—or was meant to have—the thirteen stripes of the United States flag, with the red changed to blue, and in the upper left-hand corner, instead of the stars, was the British union with red stripes on a white field. On the fly was a sun encircled by the motto *Lux Libertatis*, and on the face of the sun was the head of Washington, underneath which were the words, "In his example there is safety". The whole would undoubtedly have taken the first prize for complication at any world's fair ever held. The meaning of it is partly explained in Austin's own words:

<sup>1</sup> The assertion made by John Quincy Adams in Congress, December 12, 1837, based on statements in Mayo's *Political Sketches of Eight Years in Washington* (*Niles' Register*, LIII, 266), to the effect that the revolutionizing of Texas was the result of a conspiracy planned by Sam Houston, was incorrect. Von Holst apparently credits the story (*Constitutional History of the United States*, II, 562), and Schouler definitely accepts it (*History of the United States*, IV, 251); but the Texan revolution cannot be explained in this way. See *The Nation* for August 13, 1903, 133-134.

"The shape of the English jack indicates the origin of the North American people. The stripes indicate the immediate descent of the most of the Texans".<sup>1</sup> It would seem that the design was intended especially as an appeal for recognition both by the United States and by England, but it was doubtless intended to suggest annexation as well.

Annexation, in fact, appears to have been the irresistible conclusion of the Texan logic from the moment that the colonists determined to break away from Mexico. The independence that necessity had forced them to assert was not desired for its own sake. It involved many problems that they were ill prepared to face, and from which admission to the United States would be a happy escape. Nearly all of them had been born and reared in that country,<sup>2</sup> and they were much attached to it and desirous, to the point of eagerness, to renew their citizenship therein. It is evident that they did not appreciate the difficulties connected with annexation. If they themselves were willing freely to offer the rich gift of Texas to the American Union, how could it, in any rational spirit, be declined? To them the idea was one not easily comprehended. Even the commissioners did not discover the strength of the anti-Texas feeling in the United States. They wrote home from Washington, April 6, 1836, while Houston was still retreating before the Mexican army, and while the outlook for Texas—though the commissioners did not then know it—was darkest, that they thought the United States government was ready to recognize Texas and, if it so desired, to admit it into the Union on liberal terms. The want, however, of official news from their government and of proper credentials for themselves prevented them from giving their judgment any test.

The commissioners already named were replaced in March, 1836, by Messrs. George C. Childress and Robert Hamilton; and these two, in June following, by James Collinsworth and P. W. Grayson. Meanwhile the Mexicans had been utterly defeated and driven from Texas, leaving their general, Santa Anna, and several hundred of his men prisoners. In September the permanent government of Texas was organized by a general election at which the question of annexation was submitted to the people, and a practically unanimous vote was cast in favor of the measure.<sup>3</sup> At this election Sam Hous-

<sup>1</sup> *The Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association*, III, 172. The design did not commend itself to the Texas authorities; but their objection, I think it can be shown, was not to its significance.

<sup>2</sup> See the address of the General Council of Texas to the Citizens of the United States, October 26, 1835. *Niles' Register*, XLIX, 234-235.

<sup>3</sup> There were 3,277 for, and 91 against it.

ton was chosen president. He appointed Stephen F. Austin secretary of state, and William H. Wharton minister to the United States. A little later Memucan Hunt was sent to act in conjunction with Wharton, and Fairfax Catlett was appointed secretary of legation with the authority of *chargé* when the ministers should be absent from Washington.

The negotiations that went on between the two governments from the expulsion of the Mexicans up to the end of the Jackson administration, March 4, 1837, referred primarily to the question of recognition; but the subject was always considered with that of annexation, to which recognition was prerequisite, more or less in view. Recognition came at length in the closing days of that administration by legislative action that was virtually final. It is impossible to detail here the whole course of the negotiation, but it may be worth while to note some features of the correspondence relating more directly to annexation, because of the light it affords as to the situation on both sides.

In regard to the attitude of the United States authorities, the letters of the Texan commissioners to their government serve to indicate that they were, on the whole, assured of sympathy. To President Burnet, Austin wrote from New Orleans, June 10, 1836, that he believed that if he had been furnished with the necessary official documents, he could have secured recognition before leaving Washington. The feeling there was decidedly ardent in favor of Texas. On July 16 Collinsworth and Grayson wrote President Burnet that they had had two interviews with Secretary Forsyth and had found him uncommunicative; but he had stated that he knew the annexation of Texas was a favorite measure—when it could be accomplished with propriety—of President Jackson's.<sup>1</sup> Again, August 11, Grayson wrote W. H. Jack, then secretary of state under Houston, as follows: "As I have said before, there is in my mind no doubt that the present Administration, *can carry the measure of Annexation*,—General Jackson feels the utmost solicitude for it and we know how much that will count."<sup>2</sup> November 13, Collinsworth wrote that he had secured an interview with President Jackson and had been informed that nothing could be done until after a report from the United States agent that had been sent to Texas; and he added that, without pretending to have official infor-

<sup>1</sup> Diplomatic, Consular, and Domestic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, file 295. This collection, of which the full title is given in this instance, will be cited hereafter simply as Diplomatic Correspondence of Texas.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, file 618.

mation, he thought it safe to hazard the opinion that Jackson was in favor of the measures contained in their instructions.<sup>1</sup>

Now and then a note of doubt brings discord into this cheerful song of diplomacy. For example, Fairfax Catlett writes to Austin from Mobile, January 11, 1837, after having read Jackson's message of December 21:

You have doubtless by this time received President Jackson's message in relation to Texas affairs. I cannot express the regret, with which I gradually awoke to the unwelcome truth, that *he* is opposed to the immediate recognition of Texian independence. I did not anticipate so cold-blooded a policy from him.

Such fears and depressing speculations, however, are only for a moment. So long as Jackson is President, the general tone of the correspondence is sometimes impatient, but almost invariably hopeful. Catlett himself continues in the same letter as follows:

There is something within me however, that whispers that the message was a message of expediency not intended to sway the Congress from a just and generous measure, but to lull the jealousy of foreign powers, and gull the national vanity of miserable Mexico, while the work goes not the less surely on, and approaches the culmination of all that you most desire; — not only recognition but annexation likewise.

On the Texas side appears a strong and practically unanimous desire for annexation, and confidence that it will not be long delayed. In his letter of September 12, 1836, from Velasco, Henry M. Morfit, the agent whom Jackson had sent to Texas, informed Forsyth, after summarizing the conditions on which Burnet's cabinet had agreed to offer the new-born republic to the United States, that

the desire of the people to be admitted into our confederacy is so prevailing, that any conditions will be acceptable which will include the guaranty of a republican form of government, and will not impair the obligations of contracts. The old settlers are composed, for the most part, of industrious farmers, who are tired of the toils of war, and are anxious to raise up their families under the auspices of good laws, and leave them the inheritance of a safe and free government.<sup>2</sup>

Austin's instructions to Wharton, which are dated November 18, 1836, advise him that he is to make every effort to accomplish the second great object of his mission—annexation, and they give a lengthy and moderate discussion of the subject in almost every aspect.<sup>3</sup> December 10, Austin wrote Wharton<sup>4</sup>:

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, file 279.

<sup>2</sup> House Ex. Doc. 35, Vol. 2, 24 Cong., 2 sess., 26-27.

<sup>3</sup> *Diplomatic Correspondence of Texas*, file 52.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, file 58.

Public anxiety is unabated on the subject of annexation to the U. S. The opinion in favor of that measure is much more decisive, if possible, than when you left. It is therefore expected that you will press that matter with as much earnestness as prudence will permit.

Nor did the Texans appear to be over-solicitous about the conditions on which annexation was to be secured. Morfit's expression on this point has been quoted already. The instructions to Wharton state, in general terms, that he must guard the right of Texas to become a state without delay on an equal footing with the others; to subdivide its territory into other states as might suit itself, the limit of the number being fixed; to retain possession of the public domain, unless the United States assumed the Texas debt; to have the acts of its government held valid; to be free from restrictions on slavery not imposed on the other slaveholding states; etc. One of the most interesting features of the instructions is that which authorizes the minister, in case the Rio Grande is seriously objected to as the boundary line with Mexico, to agree to a line much farther north, which, had it been adopted, would have left in possession of that country all the Mexican settlements over which Texas had not fully established jurisdiction. Another despatch dated December 10,<sup>1</sup> and apparently written subsequent to the one for that day already mentioned, adds the following:

It is certainly desirable that Texas should enter the American Union at once, and undivided; but should you discover that this condition, if positively insisted upon, is likely materially to affect the main object, which is annexation; I am directed by the President to say, that you are at liberty to waive it, and agree to a territorial Government, with the necessary guarantees as to a state Govt., as soon as it is petitioned for. This Govt. has too much confidence in the just and liberal principles by which the United States are governed, to doubt that full and ample justice will not be done us in every respect.

The additional instructions given at the time of Hunt's appointment, which are dated December 31, 1836, and signed by J. P. Henderson, acting secretary of state, inform him that the second main object of his mission is:

The annexation of this Country to the United States either as a separate State to be on equal footing with the other States of the Union or as a Territory with the right to admission into the Union as a State when she can number a sufficient amount of population to entitle her to admission according to the Laws of the United States<sup>2</sup>.

It is easy to see that the complications of the affair, which were serious enough at the outset, but which grew rapidly as the negotia-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, file 58.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, file 701.



tions progressed, were such as to invite diplomatic chess play, and it soon began. If the mother-country of Texas would not cultivate sufficiently cordial relations with her runaway children, England and France might; and if the guards of the treaty portal refused to open at their request, some other entrance to the old home might be found. It may have been that the Texas diplomatists were not as smooth and wary as Van Buren and Forsyth, but they soon showed themselves to be resourceful. In the instructions by Acting Secretary of State Henderson to Minister Hunt, quoted in the last paragraph, the argument is suggested to Mr. Hunt that

in the event of [the refusal of (?)] that Government to receive this country into the Union either as a State or as a Territory it may become necessary for Texas to form a Treaty of Amity and Commerce with England or some other European power which would forever and entirely preclude the people of the United States from enjoying any of the benefits resulting to Texas from the richness of her soil, commerce, etc etc These reasons may be very forcibly impressed particularly upon the Representatives of the Northern States from whom we may expect to meet the greatest opposition, because should Texas be attached to the United States the immense consumption of those articles principally manufactured in the Northern States will more than compensate for the additional strength which its annexation will add to the political influence of the south.

A little further along in the same document Henderson advises Hunt as follows:

In the event that there should be doubts entertained whether a treaty made with this Government for its annexation to the United States would be ratified by a constitutional majority of the Senate of the United States you are instructed to call the attention of the authorities of that Government to the propriety and the practicability of passing a law by both houses (in which it would require a bare majority) taking in this Country as a part of her Territory, this<sup>1</sup> law could be passed, (provided Congress has the power to do so) based upon the vote of the people of Texas at the last election but in framing such an act great care should be used in order to secure all of the rights of Texas and its citizens as fully as you are instructed to have them attended to in any treaty which may be made, if<sup>1</sup> such an act is passed you can give that Government the fullest assurance that it will be approved by this Government and people. But inasmuch as this is rather a novel position you will speak of it with great prudence and caution.

This is the first definite suggestion which I have been able to find of the expedient made so familiar by its later use in securing annexation when the method by treaty had failed. The instructions of Austin to Wharton, November 18, 1836, indicate the possibility of a second available string for the annexation bow, but it is only

<sup>1</sup> So in the original, but this word should have begun a new sentence.



by a somewhat uncertain implication. Wharton is to use his "discretion as to the proper mode of bringing . . . [the subject] before the executive or Congress". It may be that the use of the word "Congress" is inadvertent, and that the meaning is that Wharton shall simply use his discretion in seeking to secure favorable action by the United States Senate. This construction, however, appears improbable. It is more likely that the alternative form of Austin's expression reflects the idea of a real alternative in the method by which annexation may be obtained. His statement implies that the subject may be laid either before the executive or before Congress, and in either case Wharton is to use his discretion as to the way in which he shall proceed. It is true that whenever Austin, in the same instructions and in other documents, mentions the contemplated contract of annexation, he calls it a "treaty", and in one place he even says that annexation "must be effected by a formal treaty which must be ratified by the Senate of Texas, in conformity with the Constitution"; but it seems likely that in most cases he is using the word "treaty" rather in the general sense of an international agreement than in its technical significance in the United States or the Republic of Texas.

The idea of annexation by act of Congress is found also in another document originating in a quarter far distant from Texas, and so nearly contemporaneous with Austin's letter to Wharton as to preclude the likelihood of any direct connection between them. This is the message of Governor McDuffie of South Carolina to the legislature of that state on his retirement from office in 1836.<sup>1</sup> He said:

You are doubtless aware that the people of Texas, by an almost unanimous vote, have expressed their desire to be admitted into our confederacy, and application will probably be made to congress for that purpose. In my opinion, congress ought not even to entertain such a proposition, in the present state of the controversy.

The report made by the Senate Committee<sup>2</sup> on Federal Relations, to which this part of the message was referred, expresses the conviction that when Texas has established a *de facto* government clothed with all the attributes of sovereignty and independence, the questions of recognition and of annexation may safely be confided to Congress.

The recognition of the independence of Texas cleared the way for the direct effort to secure annexation; but the struggle involved had shown the Texans how many and how great were the difficulties to

<sup>1</sup> *Niles' Register*, LI, 229-230.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 277. The House report is *ibid.*, 242.

be overcome. Their desire was unchanged; but enthusiasm was giving way to circumspection, and they were learning to curb their eagerness. Five months were suffered to elapse before Hunt, who was now sole minister of Texas at Washington,<sup>1</sup> took up the matter officially with the United States government. But, before this phase of the movement can be considered, it becomes necessary to explain the difficulties I have mentioned; and the most serious of them, I need hardly say, arose from the growing opposition of the North to slavery.

Up to the time of the Texan revolution, the influence of slavery in the political and social development of Texas had been of some importance, but it had not had the effect which historians have usually represented. The colonization of Texas was but another wave of the same tide of expansion that had already carried Anglo-American civilization westward over the Alleghenies and across the Mississippi. The causes of it had little connection with slavery. The friction with Mexico brought about by the antislavery legislation of the Mexican government served for one or two brief periods to retard the growth of the colonies, but it disappeared before 1830 and played no appreciable part in bringing on the revolution. Neither was the material help given Texas from the United States in the course of the revolution the result, in my opinion, of any systematic thought for the expansion of slavery. The principal motive that carried "volunteer immigrants", as they were called, to Texas during the latter part of 1835 and the first part of the following year is well illustrated by an anecdote published in the *Texas Almanac* for 1861 (p. 75) and attributed to General H. D. McLeod. It is to the effect that when Ward's battalion, which had been raised in Georgia, was passing through Montgomery, Alabama, on its way to Texas in the winter of 1835, it paraded for recruiting purposes. A flag at the head of the column bore the motto "Texas and Liberty"; but, as the battalion marched along the street, a wit among the bystanders suggested that the words be changed to "Texas, Liberty, and Land". This joke puts the matter in a nutshell. I am aware that some will differ from me in the opinion just stated; and, while my aims are expository and not polemic, I regret that the limits of this paper forbid any defense of my position. It is my intention to publish ere long a statement of the evidence by which it is determined; but the subject is too large for adequate treatment here and must therefore be passed over for the present.

The struggle for annexation, however, centers about the slavery issue; but here again the point of view of our historians, it seems

<sup>1</sup> Wharton had left the United States soon after recognition was secured.

to me, has often been incorrect. Slavery is not to be charged with the success of the movement. On the contrary, it alone roused an opposition which came perilously near preventing, for a period that no one can estimate, the acquisition of Texas and leaving it a barrier to the westward extension of the United States, an agency for the promotion of foreign interests, and a menace to our national unity. That the slaveholding interest alone could not have accomplished annexation goes without saying. The states it controlled did not have votes enough for that in either house of Congress. The result can hardly be interpreted otherwise than as a triumph of the impulse toward expansion which has so often manifested itself in our history and against which the brave energy of John Quincy Adams and the matchless eloquence of Clay and Webster were arrayed in vain. Had there been no slavery in Texas, the triumph would have been achieved with less than half the struggle. Had there been none in either country, there would have been no struggle at all. If the application of Texas had but come a few years earlier, it is probable that recognition and annexation would have been secured in quick succession and with comparative ease. The slavery issue would not then have so complicated the process; nor is it to be supposed that the risk of war with Mexico would have proved to be any effectual hindrance. The recent Panama episode is teaching us a great deal about ourselves, and I cannot believe that in the twenties and thirties of the nineteenth century we were essentially different.

As the hands pointed, however, on the clock of destiny, the annexation movement was ill-timed. While the quarrel of Texas with Mexico was passing from difference and recrimination to defiance and the rude arbitrament of war, the genius of Occidental civilization had girded itself for mighty work on both sides of the Atlantic. A broadening conception of the rights of man had begun to threaten privilege in every quarter. The rising of the American demos had overthrown the political aristocrats of the seaboard and seated in the presidential chair the king of the western commonalty. The July revolution had brought France a faint reminder of the days of '89, and, as it spread, had given the throne of continental Europe a warning shake. In England Parliamentary reform had relieved the abuses of five hundred years, and the new philanthropy had abolished slavery in all the colonies of Great Britain, and had paid the bill. Finally, just at the time when Texas was engaged in its desperate struggle against the Mexican invaders, the trumpet-call to the "irrepressible conflict" was sounded by both sides on the floor of the American Congress, where issue was joined concerning

be overcome. Their desire was unchanged; but enthusiasm was giving way to circumspection, and they were learning to curb their eagerness. Five months were suffered to elapse before Hunt, who was now sole minister of Texas at Washington,<sup>1</sup> took up the matter officially with the United States government. But, before this phase of the movement can be considered, it becomes necessary to explain the difficulties I have mentioned; and the most serious of them, I need hardly say, arose from the growing opposition of the North to slavery.

Up to the time of the Texan revolution, the influence of slavery in the political and social development of Texas had been of some importance, but it had not had the effect which historians have usually represented. The colonization of Texas was but another wave of the same tide of expansion that had already carried Anglo-American civilization westward over the Alleghenies and across the Mississippi. The causes of it had little connection with slavery. The friction with Mexico brought about by the antislavery legislation of the Mexican government served for one or two brief periods to retard the growth of the colonies, but it disappeared before 1830 and played no appreciable part in bringing on the revolution. Neither was the material help given Texas from the United States in the course of the revolution the result, in my opinion, of any systematic thought for the expansion of slavery. The principal motive that carried "volunteer immigrants", as they were called, to Texas during the latter part of 1835 and the first part of the following year is well illustrated by an anecdote published in the *Texas Almanac* for 1861 (p. 75) and attributed to General H. D. McLeod. It is to the effect that when Ward's battalion, which had been raised in Georgia, was passing through Montgomery, Alabama, on its way to Texas in the winter of 1835, it paraded for recruiting purposes. A flag at the head of the column bore the motto "Texas and Liberty"; but, as the battalion marched along the street, a wit among the bystanders suggested that the words be changed to "Texas, Liberty, and Land". This joke puts the matter in a nutshell. I am aware that some will differ from me in the opinion just stated; and, while my aims are expository and not polemic, I regret that the limits of this paper forbid any defense of my position. It is my intention to publish ere long a statement of the evidence by which it is determined; but the subject is too large for adequate treatment here and must therefore be passed over for the present.

The struggle for annexation, however, centers about the slavery issue; but here again the point of view of our historians, it seems

<sup>1</sup> Wharton had left the United States soon after recognition was secured.

to me, has often been incorrect. Slavery is not to be charged with the success of the movement. On the contrary, it alone roused an opposition which came perilously near preventing, for a period that no one can estimate, the acquisition of Texas and leaving it a barrier to the westward extension of the United States, an agency for the promotion of foreign interests, and a menace to our national unity. That the slaveholding interest alone could not have accomplished annexation goes without saying. The states it controlled did not have votes enough for that in either house of Congress. The result can hardly be interpreted otherwise than as a triumph of the impulse toward expansion which has so often manifested itself in our history and against which the brave energy of John Quincy Adams and the matchless eloquence of Clay and Webster were arrayed in vain. Had there been no slavery in Texas, the triumph would have been achieved with less than half the struggle. Had there been none in either country, there would have been no struggle at all. If the application of Texas had but come a few years earlier, it is probable that recognition and annexation would have been secured in quick succession and with comparative ease. The slavery issue would not then have so complicated the process; nor is it to be supposed that the risk of war with Mexico would have proved to be any effectual hindrance. The recent Panama episode is teaching us a great deal about ourselves, and I cannot believe that in the twenties and thirties of the nineteenth century we were essentially different.

As the hands pointed, however, on the clock of destiny, the annexation movement was ill-timed. While the quarrel of Texas with Mexico was passing from difference and recrimination to defiance and the rude arbitrament of war, the genius of Occidental civilization had girded itself for mighty work on both sides of the Atlantic. A broadening conception of the rights of man had begun to threaten privilege in every quarter. The rising of the American demos had overthrown the political aristocrats of the seaboard and seated in the presidential chair the king of the western commonalty. The July revolution had brought France a faint reminder of the days of '89, and, as it spread, had given the throne of continental Europe a warning shake. In England Parliamentary reform had relieved the abuses of five hundred years, and the new philanthropy had abolished slavery in all the colonies of Great Britain, and had paid the bill. Finally, just at the time when Texas was engaged in its desperate struggle against the Mexican invaders, the trumpet-call to the "irrepressible conflict" was sounded by both sides on the floor of the American Congress, where issue was joined concerning

the right of petition relative to slavery. The personality of Adams and Calhoun, the two great leaders who stood over against each other in this opening fight,<sup>1</sup> is a sufficient guaranty of the honesty and strength of the convictions that clashed. It is, in fact, devotion to their faith, religious, political, and social, that has given the Teutonic stock world-wide supremacy. Though it has often inspired the determined champions of error, in the long run it has always made for truth and right.

The issue of annexation was thus involved from the outset with that of the nationalization and expansion of slavery. The occasion brought the most extensive use of the right that had been challenged—so far as it applied to this distinctive Southern institution—that our history has ever witnessed; and when the stream of petitions relative to Texas began to pour in upon Congress, it mingled with a similar stream of those praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. Along with the petitions came legislative resolutions from various states relating to the same subjects. The people were becoming profoundly stirred; and this sudden manifestation of unfamiliar forces threw most of the political leaders into a state of absolute terror. Even Jackson adopted an attitude of caution entirely foreign to his nature, while Van Buren studied the situation and trimmed, and Clay, "thinking too precisely on the event", was driven to fatal irresolution.

Those who have gathered their knowledge of the relations of the Republic of Texas with the United States from the standard histories rather than from the sources will probably have the impression that a harmonious outcry for recognition and annexation went up from the slaveholding states as soon as the question was presented. There was, however, one notable exception. In his message to the South Carolina legislature near the end of the year 1836,<sup>2</sup> the retiring governor, George McDuffie, protested strongly against any action on behalf of Texas. After a ringing argument in favor of guarding the domestic institutions of the state against outside interference, he went on to extend the doctrine to the case of Texas. The expressions in his message most in point are as follows:

I have looked with very deep concern, not unmingled with regret, upon the occurrences which have taken place during the present year, in various parts of the United States, relative to the civil war which is still in progress, between the republic of Mexico and one of her revolted

<sup>1</sup> I have not forgotten the Missouri Compromise, but I am inclined to think students of American history will agree that the real beginning of the "irrepressible conflict" was in the struggle over the right of petition with reference to slavery.

<sup>2</sup> *Niles' Register*, LI, 229-230.



provinces. It is true that no country can be responsible for the sympathies of its citizens ; but I am nevertheless utterly at a loss to perceive what title either of the parties to this controversy can have to the sympathies of the American people. If it be alleged that the insurgents of Texas are emigrants from the United States, it is obvious to reply that, by their voluntary expatriation, under whatever circumstances of adventure, of speculation, of honor, or of infamy, they have forfeited all claim to our fraternal regard. . . . There is but too much reason to believe that many of them have gone as mere adventurers, speculating upon the chances of establishing an independent government in Texas, and of seizing that immense and fertile domain by the title of the sword. But be this as it may, when they became citizens of Mexico, they became subject to the constitution and laws of that country ; and whatever changes the Mexican people may have since made in that constitution and those laws, they are matters with which foreign states can have no concern, and of which they have no right to take cognizance. I trust, therefore, that the state of South Carolina will give no countenance, direct or indirect, open or concealed, to any acts which may compromise the neutrality of the United States, or bring into question their plighted faith. . . . If we admit Texas into our union, while Mexico is still waging war against that province, with a view to re-establish her supremacy over it, we shall, *by the very act itself*, make ourselves a party to the war. Nor can we take this step, without incurring this heavy responsibility, until Mexico herself shall recognize the independence of her revolted province.

The part of the message relative to Texas was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations in both the House and the Senate. The House committee brought in a favorable report, which was adopted,<sup>1</sup> and the nature of which is sufficiently indicated by the following extract :

The committee fully agree with his excellency on the propriety and sound policy of the government of the United States maintaining a strict neutrality with all foreign nations, and especially with Mexico in her contest with Texas ; and that we are the last people who should set an example of impertinent interference with the internal concerns of other states. . . . South Carolina cannot consent, under a supposed idea of self-interest, to violate the sanctity of the law of nations, or that neutrality which should always be guarded by the United States towards a foreign nation engaged in an internal struggle. Under the present circumstances, to acknowledge the independence of Texas and receive her into this union, could be no less than a declaration of war against Mexico, and of doubtful policy to the older slave-holding states.

These documents have been referred to thus at length because, among other reasons, of the exceptional nature of the argument as coming from Calhoun's own state, the very citadel of the slavery interest, and especially from such a champion of that interest as

<sup>1</sup> *Niles' Register*, LI, 242, 273.



George McDuffie.<sup>1</sup> To those who believe that annexation was due to slavery alone, it should be profoundly instructive.

The Senate committee made an unfavorable report, which was adopted "by nearly a unanimous vote"<sup>2</sup>. The report was presented by Ex-governor James Hamilton, who soon became identified with Texas; but it contains nothing that stands out sufficiently for reproduction here.

In the interval between the act of recognition and the proffer of annexation, the Texas minister at Washington, like Van Buren, studied the situation, and made voluminous reports. These are of great interest and value in following the tortuous course of the administration as it sought to make up its mind. April 15, 1837, Hunt wrote to Henderson from Vicksburg, Mississippi<sup>3</sup>, that he thought a secret agent should be sent to England to purchase a treaty there with valuable commercial concessions. Recognition by England, he thought, would guarantee annexation. The South was so ardent therefor that failure would dissolve the Union, and the Northern politicians would yield before going to that extremity. He went on to say that nothing had so increased the zeal of Southern politicians for Texas as the question of John Quincy Adams in the House whether it would be in order to present a petition from slaves. By this act one of their worst enemies had helped them more than "the most studied movements" of their best friends. Open negotiations with Great Britain would probably prevent annexation by provoking a paper issue with the Abolitionists, and action should be taken in a way that would cause as little excitement as possible; for fanaticism would temporarily overrule the wisest measures. But the Northerners were a law-abiding people; and if a treaty of annexation could be secured, the trouble would all be over. He added, by the way, that, having secured recognition, and not expecting favorable action as to annexation for the time, he thought it might be best for him to visit Thomas H. Benton, who could do Texas more service in that respect perhaps than any one else in the United States.

<sup>1</sup> McDuffie afterward became an ardent annexationist. As senator from South Carolina, he voted for the joint resolution in 1845 and made one of the strongest arguments in its favor that the occasion called forth. Relative to this, Daniel Webster remarked, in the course of a controversial tilt with McDuffie in the Senate, July 28, 1846: "I think the most powerful argument ever addressed to the people of the United States against the annexation of Texas was from the Governor of South Carolina; and I think the greatest speech in favor of it was made by the Senator from South Carolina—*idem personem [sic]*!" See *Congressional Globe*, 29 Cong., 1 sess., 1154.

<sup>2</sup> *Niles' Register*, LI, 277.

<sup>3</sup> Diplomatic Correspondence of Texas, file 714.

Two much more interesting letters than this were written by Catlett to Henderson during Hunt's absence from Washington in the spring of 1837. The first is dated April 29<sup>1</sup>. In it Catlett tells a curious tale of how he had been suddenly summoned to the office of the Secretary of State and informed by the chief clerk—by direction, of course, of the Secretary himself—that the department had just received some important information from the United States consul in the City of Mexico. It was to the effect that a resolution to sell Texas, "and as far south as might be deemed expedient", to the British government at twenty-five cents an acre had been introduced at a secret session of the Mexican congress and would certainly be adopted. A question as to whether the consul's letter indicated that the British government had offered to make the purchase, or would agree to it, was answered in the negative. Extracts from the letter including the most essential parts were requested and obtained. They showed that the sale was proposed in order to pay off the debt of sixty-eight million dollars due from Mexico to English subjects. These extracts were despatched in a lengthy communication dated May 7<sup>2</sup>, and containing matter of peculiar interest. Catlett sent a copy of a letter which he had written to Forsyth on May 2, and which serves to show that he had not neglected his opportunity for an important move in the diplomatic game. He thanked the Secretary very heartily for the information that had been given, and said that this regard for the welfare of Texas would "doubtless strengthen the filial feeling which it has always cherished for its parent commonwealth". He then inquired whether the United States government thought Mexico's offer to Great Britain would be accepted, and whether it would take any steps to prevent such an undesirable consummation. He went on to suggest the danger that the British government might have made secret overtures to Mexico and that, in spite of the apparent unreasonableness of the thing, it might be really seeking to possess itself of Texas. He excused himself for asking such questions as the letter contained by setting forth the deep solicitude the government of Texas would naturally feel concerning the subject, and the impossibility of its obtaining any direct information. In a paragraph following the copy of this letter Catlett explained to Henderson that he wrote the letter to call the attention of Forsyth to the fact that the subject was as important to the United States as to Texas, and that their interests in respect to it were identical. He wished also, of course, to elicit such information as he could.

<sup>1</sup> Diplomatic Correspondence of Texas, file 284.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, file 285.

Forsyth was doubtless sorry that he had allowed the cat to peep at all from the bag he was holding, and the letter of the Texas *chargé* must have cost the Secretary of State at least one sleepless night. Catlett went on to recount, in his despatch of May 7 detailing the course of the affair, that the next day (May 3) he had a note from the chief clerk of the Department of State asking him to call at his convenience, and that he presented himself at the office the same morning. As he entered, Mr. Forsyth, who was just leaving the room, saw him and invited him to an interview, which had evidently not been intended for that morning, and a very interesting colloquy ensued. Forsyth said he thought Catlett had better take back his letter; that some expressions in it, though their use was justified, might lead to future misunderstanding. He referred especially to "Parent Commonwealth". Catlett replied that the expression was not meant to indicate that Texas owed its origin to the United States government, but was intended only in compliment, since the Texans were nearly all natives of the United States, and since they had adopted the same form of government and the same institutions as those of that country. But Forsyth "said that it was an expression which would still be made use of by the enemies of the administration and by all such as were inimical to the United States and to Texas;—that all correspondence in relation to Texas would probably be called for next winter by congress, and that, while the best feeling and wishes for the prosperity of Texas were cherished, it behooved him to be careful to make no admissions, which might be interpreted as showing an undue interest in the success of our revolutionary struggle". To this Catlett answered that he knew "the situation of the United States was a delicate and embarrassing one, and that it was by no means . . . [his] desire to render it more so, but that the identity of interests between the countries was so striking and apparent, and pointed so clearly to the United States preventing Great Britain from negotiating for the purchase of Texas, that . . . [he] could not but encourage the hope, that some assurance would be given to . . . [his] Government, that if any negotiations were opened between Great Britain and Mexico, the United States would immediately interfere". "In what way could we interfere?", asked Forsyth. "By distinctly intimating", replied Catlett, "to the British Govt that the United States could never consent to Great Britain's obtaining possession of Texas". Forsyth suggested, "Great Britain in return might say the same to us"; the answer to which was, "If she did, it would be easy to reply that the United States would make no such attempt, that she had already

acknowledged the separate existence of Texas as an Independent Republic, but that if it were the unequivocal desire of the people of Texas to be admitted into this Union, that their wishes would be properly respected and listened to". At this point the exchange of argument ended, and Forsyth went on to say that, while the subject was one of common interest, he had no idea that Great Britain would accept the Mexican offer or that any overtures for the purchase of Texas had come from that country; that he would cheerfully communicate all information he could give that might be of interest to Texas, but he could express no opinion as to the policy that would be pursued by the United States; "that notwithstanding the numerous ties by which the people of the two countries were virtually bound together, it was necessary that the intercourse between their Governments should be carried on as if there was no peculiar relationship between them;—that some of the expressions in . . . [Catlett's] letter might be referred to on some future occasion as showing that an undue interest had been taken by the Government of the United States in the affairs of Texas and that he would prefer returning it to . . . [him]". Catlett then took back the letter, because, as he explained, its purpose had been accomplished. He assured Forsyth, with a refreshing assumption of innocence, that inexperience alone had prompted the writing, and the conference was at an end. In his letter to Henderson Catlett added that he had obtained information from Mr. Crallé, on which he relied as correct, that Great Britain had been approached by Mexico some time before on the subject of purchasing Texas and had given a decided refusal.

Another communication from Catlett to Henderson, written May 25 and 30<sup>1</sup>, reported that he thought the administration would use every exertion to keep down the question of annexation, but that a strong effort would be made by the South to have the matter decided by the ensuing Congress. He said Forsyth had told him that if Congress had not tied the hands of the executive, Mexico would already have been taught to respect the rights of American commerce. The despatch closed with the statement that, while many persons in the United States regarded the issue as doubtful, it was clear "to the sagacious and intelligent" that the government of that country had so far compromised itself by the act of recognition as to have made common cause with Texas; that only the imprudence of Texas could prevent the ties between them from increasing "in strength and holiness"; and that it was impossible that the deportment of Texas "should be regulated by too scrupulous an adherence to the established principles of international law".

<sup>1</sup> Diplomatic Correspondence of Texas, file 306.

As to the delay in proposing annexation, the correspondence goes to show that it was due to the refusal of the United States authorities to entertain the proposition so long as Mexico persisted in attempting to reconquer Texas. A despatch from Hunt to Henderson, dated Vicksburg, May 30, 1837<sup>1</sup>, states that Forsyth had distinctly so described the attitude of the administration. It can scarcely be doubted, however, that the refusal was due still more to the fear of a divided and uncertain public sentiment in the United States.

On July 11, Hunt reported from Washington<sup>2</sup> that he had been accorded an interview with President Van Buren, and had expressed to him the hope of nearer relations between the United States and Texas than mere diplomatic intercourse. The President had replied warmly, with dignity, and at length, but the letter reveals in what he said only "glittering . . . generalities". Hunt remarked that, in accordance with his instructions from the government of Texas, he would commit himself to no treaty stipulations until he was advised further.

In the same communication Hunt said that, while he had first urged a secret mission to Great Britain, he had finally become convinced that the appointment of a minister was wise.<sup>3</sup> The mere announcement had so aroused the Southern states to the danger of losing Texas that they would present an unbroken line of resistance to any anti-Texas administration. He thought the people south of the Potomac would prefer the dissolution of the Union to the loss of Texas. They and the people of Texas had common interests, origin, and history, and "in this age of fanaticism on the subject of slavery" they would force their government to adopt the Texans, or would create a new order of things. He was sanguine that the administration would be compelled to make annexation a "leading issue".

Hunt then proceeded to define the attitude of certain prominent men and to describe, in general terms, the whole situation. Webster had entered the field for the presidency. He and his friends were expected to be decidedly hostile to Texas. He had raised the cry of Southern preponderance in the councils of the Union. His influence was in the northern and middle states, but was dominant only in Massachusetts and Vermont; his opposition had solidified the South warmly for Texas. The Cabinet was said to be sectionally divided on the question of annexation, but Hunt had it on good authority that Woodbury would support the views of the President, which would give Texas a majority of one. Clamor about financial

<sup>1</sup> Diplomatic Correspondence of Texas, file 718.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, file 719.

<sup>3</sup> Henderson had been appointed.

troubles had been weakening the Jackson party, and in New York and Pennsylvania, where the President was considered invincible, recent events seemed ominous of defeat. In the south everything depended on his course as to slavery, and nothing else would help him there so much as hearty support of annexation. Hunt had thought it not unwise to encourage the idea that Texas would stand by the administration under whose auspices it entered the Union. He suggested also the propriety of his being duly authorized, if the subject of annexation should come before the next Congress, "to employ some efficient and able person, *having influence* with the members of the non-slaveholding states, to counteract the intrigues of Mr. Webster and the enemies of Texas". He repeated that "a well paid, efficient, and if you please, secret agent, acting under my direction and having influence with the members of the non-slaveholding States, would be a most important enablement unto the success of our cause". He advised against an attempt at conciliation of the party "known . . . as Northern fanatics"; for that might impair "that firm, devoted and enthusiastic unanimity of the South, which is, indeed, our main support".

August 4, 1837,<sup>1</sup> came the long-delayed proposal of annexation in a formal communication from Hunt to Forsyth. The Texas minister sketched the history of that country and said that it sought annexation because of its kinship in blood, language, and institutions with the United States. He gave its estimated area and population, and a brief statement of its resources. Texas, he said, neither feared reconquest by Mexico, nor sought protection against European interference. It offered a market for all agricultural products of the United States except sugar and cotton. Delay might be fatal to annexation, for Texas was establishing relations with foreign powers that might develop insurmountable obstacles; and it might, by means of commercial treaties having special relation to the two states mentioned, and because of its better adapted soil, rival the United States in the production of both and drain away the population from that country. If Texas remained independent, the very similarity between the two countries would bring about a conflict of interests. Annexation would insure the United States control of the Gulf of Mexico, and might contribute to peace with the Indians on the frontier of the two countries. The question was asked "in the name of national honor, humanity, and justice" if a nation whose career had been marked by constant violation of treaty obligations, by licentious revolutions, and by shameful mistreatment of its people

<sup>1</sup> House Ex. Doc. 40, 25 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 2-11.

had not "thereby forfeited all claims to the respect of the Governments of civilized nations".

A letter from Hunt to R. A. Irion<sup>1</sup> written the same day reported this formal opening of negotiations to the government of Texas. The minister said that he still hoped for annexation, but the course of the official newspaper (the *Globe*) had not been encouraging. Hunt's friend and relative, John C. Jones of North Carolina, who was intimate with the editor, Mr. Blair, had sought to influence him to support annexation, but had failed. Blair's private opinions were in favor of it, but the President had instructed him to be neutral for a time. Van Buren would favor the most popular course as soon as he ascertained what it was.

August 10, Hunt wrote Irion<sup>2</sup> concerning the proposal made six days before: "I thought it best to say nothing of the slave question, which as you know is more important than any other connected with the subject of annexation". The President of the United States seemed anxious to suppress the desire which Hunt had shown to push on the movement; and one of Van Buren's intimate friends had urged the deferring of the project so strongly that a show of resentment had been required in order to get rid of him. This gentleman was told by Hunt that, if annexation failed, the President and his advisers would be responsible for the result, which might be fatal to the Union. The Texas minister remarked in passing that he himself was ardently attached to the Union, and that he thought annexation would prolong, if not perpetuate it. His fears concerning Van Buren's attitude led him to suggest that Irion should address a proposal for annexation to some member of Congress to be presented to that body. The name was to be left blank for Hunt to fill in when the occasion came for the use of the document. A postscript dated August 11 said that Hunt had just ascertained Forsyth to be violently opposed to annexation.

Not till August 25, did Forsyth reply to the proposal of annexation. His answer<sup>3</sup> disclaimed at the outset any unfriendly spirit toward Texas. This was followed up by declining to look into the historical facts recited by Hunt and by expressing the hope that the act of recognition would lead Texas to cherish close relations with the United States and abstain from connections detrimental to that country. The proposed acquisition of territory would be different

<sup>1</sup> Diplomatic Correspondence of Texas, file 726. Irion had succeeded J. P. Henderson as secretary of state.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, file 728.

<sup>3</sup> House Ex. Doc. 40, 25 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 11-13. The refusal of the proposition, while perfectly clear, was not in direct terms, but only by implication.



from any the United States had ever made, inasmuch as it involved the absorption of an independent sovereignty. It involved also a question of a war with Mexico, to which country the United States was under treaty obligations that precluded even reserving the proposal for future consideration.

The rejoinder of Hunt,<sup>1</sup> which was dated September 12, argued that the negotiations for the purchase of Texas from Mexico before Mexican independence had been acknowledged by Spain involved as great a breach of treaty obligations, if the principle on which the United States claimed to act could be allowed, as the acceptance of the proffered annexation. Undeniably, he thought, a sovereign power had as much right to dispose of the whole of itself to another as to dispose of a part. Texas did not feel under obligations to follow any special foreign policy because it had been recognized first by the United States; and if its relations should become such as seriously to affect the interests of that country, he thought complaint would be unreasonable after the offer of all it had to give had been declined. But he assured the Secretary of State, and through him the President of the United States, that the prompt and decisive rejection of the proposal would not be charged to unfriendliness. Six days later Hunt wrote Irion<sup>2</sup> that he hoped a resolution would be introduced in one of the houses of Congress at the approaching regular session that would request the Texas minister to state the terms on which Texas sought admission into the Union, and that a motion to accept the terms would be adopted by both houses. The President would add his approval.

For about a year from this time forward the despatches tell a tale of daily alternating hopes and fears, with the prospect of annexation gradually on the decline. October 20, 1837, Hunt wrote Irion<sup>3</sup> that the state of the question was "delicate and precarious". Success seemed to depend on war between the United States and Mexico. The friends of the measure, taking their cue from the President and the Cabinet, were begging for time to save the party in the north, while Hunt himself was urging the danger of alienating the South by delay. He had threatened, in conversation with an influential friend of Van Buren's, to ask the Texas government for a recall; but a communication so hedged about with secrecy that he could not even state its substance in the despatch induced him to remain. On the next day, October 21, P. W. Grayson, who had just come from Texas to the assistance of Hunt, wrote President Houston a sup-

<sup>1</sup> House Ex. Doc. 40, 25 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 14-18.

<sup>2</sup> Diplomatic Correspondence of Texas, file 732.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, file 736.

plementary note, in which he said that the annexationists were then depending much on Clay to lead the fight for the measure if the Cabinet continued its equivocal course; and he made the interesting observation by the way that Hunt's letters would show "that even the old fanatic J. Q. Adams is committed *for the acquisition of Texas*". Hunt, in a letter of November 15 to Irion,<sup>1</sup> represents Forsyth as being then "a warm advocate for the measure of annexation and for having it accomplished as early as possible". The friends of the measure were increasing very fast in the west. Hunt was informed that there was not a single dissident in the Illinois delegation. Senator Allen of Ohio favored the measure. So did both the senators from Michigan personally, and they promised to do so officially if their constituents could be reconciled to it. But December 7, Grayson reports to Houston that "*there is no solid foundation on which to build a hope that the measure can now be carried . . . both parties here are afraid to move in the matter for fear of losing popularity in the North*".

On January 4, 1838, was initiated the attempt, so often suggested in the letters of Hunt and Grayson, to accomplish annexation by Congressional action. Naturally the work began in the Senate. There were found the most determined and aggressive champions of the measure; and initiative by that body would not seem too great a departure from the well-trodden paths of diplomacy. It should be observed, in fact, that the plan does not seem, for the time, to have contemplated action by the legislative independently of the treaty-making power, but only such a step as would force the hand of the unwilling executive and push him into negotiations. On the day named, Preston of South Carolina introduced in the Senate a resolution sounding the now famous political war-cry of "reannexation" and asserting the desirability and expediency of resuming possession of Texas, which was declared to have been "surrendered" in 1819. Three months later he spoke for two hours in support of his resolution. The paralyzing effect of the subject is sufficiently illustrated by the fact that, though the Senate has never been famous for "dumb sittings", when he sat down there seemed to be no one else that wished to say a word. Walker, however, was not present. June 14, the resolution was taken up again and tabled by the decisive vote of 24 to 14.<sup>2</sup> How the question of annexation was raised during the same session in the House, and how it was dealt with will appear further on.

<sup>1</sup> Diplomatic Correspondence of Texas, file 735.

<sup>2</sup> *Niles' Register*, LIV, 255.

By the end of January, 1838, Hunt began to consider the outlook for annexation hopeless. On the thirty-first of that month he sent Irion a long communication<sup>1</sup> describing the contemporaneous aspect of the movement in detail. He was confident that he had fully ascertained the views of the administration and the general feeling in Congress, and he wrote, "I can no longer repel the conviction that the measure is utterly impracticable under existing circumstances". His despatch is a confidentially frank, searching, and faithful review of the situation. After remarking that the acquisition of Texas had been the settled policy of the United States for twelve years, as the instructions of Secretaries of State Clay, Van Buren, McLane, and Forsyth to ministers in Mexico showed clearly, and after stating that the President and several of the Cabinet still wished it, he continues:

But hampered as they are by their party trammels on the one hand, and their treaty obligations with Mexico on the other, by the furious opposition of all the free States, by the fear of incurring the charge of false dealing and injustice, and of involving this country in a war in which they are now doubtful whether they would even be supported by a majority of their own citizens, and which would be at once branded by their enemies at home and abroad as an unjust war, instigated for the very purpose of gaining possession of Texas and for no other, they dare not and will not come out openly for the measure, so long as the relative position of the three parties continues the same as it is at present.

Hunt then goes on to say that he had relied for success on a declaration of war by the United States against Mexico, which had finally become altogether improbable. "If the United States desire Texas", he says, "the proposition should now come from them. Our true policy now, in every aspect of view, is to appear indifferent upon the subject, and leave it for this government to solicit of us the consummation of a measure which, I am well assured will be the more desired by them, the less solicitous we appear about it ourselves." Describing the situation in Congress, he expresses the fear that Preston's resolutions will be tabled, and then adds:

In the course of a confidential conversation, which I had with Mr. Clay, a few days since, he assured me that he was friendly to the annexation of Texas, but that in his opinion, the time had not yet arrived when the question could be taken up in congress with any probability of success. Petitions upon petitions still continue daily pouring in against us from the North and East.

Finally, some lines written later say that the hopes of the annexationists have just been revived by a report of prospective changes in the Cabinet and the recently developed uneasiness of the adminis-

<sup>1</sup> Diplomatic Correspondence of Texas, file 743.

tration over the probability of a treaty between Texas and Great Britain.

Early in February Hunt writes again,<sup>1</sup> this time in a most hopeful strain. He has been led to believe that the United States government is on the point of taking active steps toward annexation. In a strictly confidential interview with Calhoun, saving the privilege of communication with the Texas government, he has learned that the administration is considering the policy of despatching a private mission to Mexico to secure the acquiescence of that country in the annexation movement. Calhoun has just received a note from a member of the Cabinet which leaves little doubt that the mission would result favorably, as information lately obtained would prove. Hunt is of the opinion that the unusual energy of the government is due mainly to the fact that he has informed Forsyth of his intention to ask to be recalled.

But the prospect of a revival of the movement was not realized. In March Hunt wrote<sup>2</sup> that he was gratified to receive instructions from President Lamar to show no further solicitude for annexation, and a few days later he reported<sup>3</sup> that several members of Congress from the south had expressed their intention, if Texas was not annexed to the Union, to "advocate its annexation to the slave holding states". March 12, he wrote<sup>4</sup> that, in his opinion and "that of many distinguished gentlemen from the South", unless Texas was annexed, the Union would soon be dissolved because of Northern interference with slavery in the south, which annexation would prevent by giving the South preponderance in the Senate. "Domestic slavery", he said, "in the United States and Texas, must, from various circumstances, stand or fall together." The failure of annexation would be at the risk of civil war in the Union, "for the fanatical spirit of abolition is unquestionably on the increase"; but the success of the measure would so check that spirit as to give the slaveholding states "perfect security".

Meanwhile the House was engaged in a vain struggle to keep back the question, which was seeking entry by the door of petition. This door to legislative consideration it had been sought practically to close against whatever might serve to promote the agitation of the slavery issue, but this could not be effectually done with men like John Quincy Adams in the House. The recognition of the independence of Texas in March, 1837, had brought the subject of

<sup>1</sup> February 3, Diplomatic Correspondence of Texas, file 744.

<sup>2</sup> March 3, *ibid.*, file 745.

<sup>3</sup> March 9, *ibid.*, file 746.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, file 747.

annexation, hitherto in the background, now openly to the front. The proposal made in August and its prompt rejection have been referred to already, and the claim of the conservatives and the peace makers now was that the question had been disposed of; but Adams refused to believe it. During the special session of the Twenty-fifth Congress, which met in September, 1837, and the regular session following, memorials and petitions against the annexation of Texas signed by multiplied thousands poured in and grew upon the table of the House into a mass that Howard of Maryland, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, said might be measured by cubic feet. They seem to have come mainly from Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. A few counter-petitions from the South came in, but they were evidently intended to bring that method of dealing with the subject into contempt; for the Southern members of Congress had set their faces sternly against it. But Carter of Tennessee, who doubted the expediency of annexation, stated in the House on July 13, 1838, that it had been difficult to restrain the masses in the south from petitioning Congress in its favor. The House, on December 12, 1837, had by a vote of 127 to 68 laid the whole subject of annexation, with the papers relating to it, on the table without reference; but through an inadvertence, as was afterward claimed, the petitions on the subject had been subsequently allowed to go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. On June 13, 1838, a resolution was reported in the House from that committee discharging it from further consideration of the subject. The next day Waddy Thompson, from South Carolina, offered an amendment directing the President to take the proper steps for the annexation of Texas as soon as it could be done "consistently with the treaty stipulations of this government". On the fifteenth Adams moved to recommit the report with instructions to bring in a resolution containing the declaration "That any attempt by act of congress or by treaty to annex the republic of Texas to this union would be a usurpation of power, unlawful and void, and which it would be the right and the duty of the free people of the union to resist and annul". On the sixteenth he took the floor in support of his motion and consumed the morning hour from then till July 7, the last working-day of the session but one. This made any action on the matter, and any answer to his argument, meanwhile alike impossible.<sup>1</sup>

By this time the ardor of Texas itself was abating. President Houston instructed Anson Jones, who took the place of Hunt as minister to the United States in the summer of 1838, formally to with-

<sup>1</sup> *Niles' Register*, LIV, 256, 332, *passim*.

draw the proposal for annexation, and this was done October 12.<sup>1</sup> At the end of the year the presidency of Texas passed from Houston to Lamar, who was strongly opposed to annexation, and who so expressed himself in his first message to the Texan congress. A joint resolution of that body, approved January 23, 1839,<sup>2</sup> ratified the withdrawal of the proposition. The people of Texas gave consent by silence, and the first stage of the movement was over.

GEORGE P. GARRISON.

<sup>1</sup> Diplomatic Correspondence of Texas, file 947.

<sup>2</sup> *Laws of the Republic of Texas, passed the First Session of Third Congress, 1839* (Houston, 1839), 75.

## DOCUMENTS

### *1. Alexander Hamilton's Notes in the Federal Convention of 1787.*

IN the Hamilton Papers, now in the Library of Congress, I found some folio sheets containing rough notes in Hamilton's writing, but without date, place, or descriptive heading. A penciled note on one of the sheets, evidently written at a later day, led me to believe that the lines might be some notes of debates in the Convention of 1787 for framing the Constitution, and a little study enabled me to find a corresponding note in the Madison notes. It was then a simple matter to spell out the Hamilton matter by date and speaker, and the result is now published. Fragmentary as the notes are, they add something to the known record of the debates, and possess a general as well as an individual value.

The general interest lies in this: that they outline speeches not recorded by Madison, such as Madison's own remarks on June 6; and they add to the notes made by Madison in a number of instances. Further, they offer a test of the accuracy of Madison's pen, and in only one instance do they seem to point to an error. In reporting Gerry's remarks on June 8, Madison made him say the "New States too having separate views from the old States will never come into the Union". The statement would seem to be too strong to express Gerry's meaning, for the legislation on the Northwest Territory and experiences with the western country would modify if not negative the remark. The version given by Hamilton is more correct: "New States will arise which cannot be controuled".

The personal interest is greater. Few men were better equipped than Madison to take notes, for he had long been a careful student of government, and in his closet and his experience in state and Continental legislature had recognized the great evils of the old Confederation and the crying need of a surrender by the states of some of their powers, at least sufficient to create a self-supporting central government. The notes of his researches on federative systems long passed as Washington's, because a copy in Washington's manuscript happened to be found before the Madison original came to light. Yet Madison's studies had produced almost a colorless attitude of mind, in which his learning threatened to neutralize his energy in urging definite reforms for definite evils. His influence in the Convention was small, in spite of the many times he took part in



the debates; and it was exerted rather through others than through himself. This attitude made him the best possible recorder of the debates, as he was in a receptive frame of mind, not tied fast to one or a small number of propositions, but ready to study what others had to propose. The result is to be seen in his "notes", which could only be surpassed in merit by a full record of the proceedings.

Hamilton's experience had been different. His service at headquarters during the most trying years of the Revolution had given him a grasp of the inherent weakness of the Confederation that was improved by his service in the Continental Congress. He approached the question of reform from a more practical side than that of Madison, and this made him the more intent upon a special reform to meet the difficulties he had felt in field and in Congress. Hence his leaning to monarchy, a position that could not be acceptable to the Convention any more than it could be to the people of the United States. His notes were taken on the days when the central government was under discussion, and he has added "notes" and "remarks" that clearly indicate his own ideas, something that a really good reporter, like Madison, would not have done. The personal element is therefore stronger in these few notes than in the whole of Madison's record.

WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD.

#### I. NOTES FOR JUNE 1, 1787.

[HAMILTON.]

[MADISON.]

1 — The way to prevent a majority from having an interest to oppress the minority is to enlarge the sphere.

Madison

2 — Elective Monarchies turbulent and unhappy —

If [Executive\*Power] large, we shall have the Evils of Elective Monarchies (Charles R. King, *The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, I, 588.)

Men unwilling to admit so decided a superiority of merit in an individual as to accede to his appointment to so preeminent a station —

If several are admitted as there will be many competitors of equal merit they may be all included — contention prevented — and the republican genius consulted —

Randolph —

I Situation of this Country peculiar —

<sup>1</sup> With the exception of the first, these excerpts are from *The Writings of James Madison*, edited by Gaillard Hunt, Volume III.

II Taught the people an erva-  
sion to Monarchy —

III All their constitutions op-  
posed to it —

IV — Fixed character of the  
people opposed to it —

V — If proposed twill prevent a  
fair discussion of the plan.

VI — Why cannot three execute?

— Great exertions only requisite  
on particular occasions

— Legislature may appoint a  
dictator when necessary —

— Seeds of destruction — Slaves  
— [former Continental army struck  
out] might be safely enlisted —

— May appoint men devoted to  
them — and even bribe the legis-  
lature by offices —

— Chief Magistrate must be free  
from impeachment

extent — manners —

Confederated republic unites  
advantages and banishes disad-  
vantages of other kinds of gov-  
ernments —

rendering the executive ineli-  
gible an infringement of the right  
of election —

peculiar talents requisite for  
*executive*, therefore ought to be  
opportunity of ascertaining his tal-  
ents — therefore frequent change —

Princ 1 The further men are  
from the ultimate point of im-  
portance the readier they will be  
[to] concur in a change —

2 Civilization approximates the  
different species of governments —

3 — Vigour is the result of sev-  
eral principles — Activity wisdom  
— confidence —

4 — Extent of limits will occa-  
sion the non attendance of re-  
mote members and tend to throw  
the government into the hands  
of the Country near the seat  
of government — a reason for  
strengthening the upper branch  
and multiplying the Inducements  
to attendance —

M<sup>r</sup> Bedford was strongly op-  
posed to so long a term as seven  
years. He begged the Committee  
to consider what the situation of  
the Country would be, in case the  
first magistrate should be saddled  
on it for such a period and it  
should be found on trial that he  
did not possess the qualifications  
ascribed to him, or should lose  
them after his appointment.  
(*Madison*, III, 63-64.)

View [or Voice]  
of America.  
Safety to liberty  
the great object —

Wilson —

Bedford —

UOR 1

## II. NOTES FOR JUNE 6, 7, AND 8, 1787.

Sent :

A free government to be preferred to an absolute monarchy not because of the occasional violations of *liberty* or *property* but because of the tendency of the Free Government to interest the passions of the community in its favour beget public spirit and public confidence —

Re : When public mind is prepared to adopt the present plan they will outgo our proposition — They will never part with Sovereignty of the state till they are tired [?] of the state governments —

M<sup>r</sup> Pinkney. If Legislatures do not partake in the appointment of they will be more jealous

The State Legislatures also he said would be more jealous, and more ready to thwart the National Gov<sup>t</sup>, if excluded from a participation in it. (P. 107.)

Pinckney — Elections by the state legislatures will be better than those by the people —

He differed from gentlemen who thought that a choice by the people w<sup>d</sup> be a better guard ag<sup>t</sup> bad measures, than by the Legislatures. (*Ibid.*)

Principle — Danger that the Executive by too frequent communication with the judicial may corrupt it — They may learn to enter into his passions —

Note — At the period which terminates the duration of the Executive there will be always an awful crisis — in the National situation.

Note. The arguments to prove that a negative would not be used would go so far as to prove that the revisionary power would not be exercised.

M<sup>r</sup> Mason — The purse and sword will be in the hands of the [*executive* struck out] — legislature.

The purse and the sword ought never to get into the same hands whether Legislative or Executive. (P. 110.)

1 One great defect of our Governments are that they do not present objects sufficiently interesting to the human mind.

1 — A reason for leaving little or nothing to the state legislatures

will be that as their objects are diminished they will be worse composed — Proper men will be less inclined to participate in them —

[June 7, 1787.]

Dickinson

11 — He would have the state legislatures elect senators, because he would bring into the general government the sense of the state Governments etc

11 — because the most respectable choices would be made —

Note — Separate states may give stronger organs to their governments and engage more the good will of Ind: — while Genl Govl

Consider the Principle of Rivalship by excluding the state Legislatures —

Mr Dickinson had two reasons for his motion. 1, because the sense of the States would be better collected through their Governments; than immediately from the people at large; 2. because he wished the Senate to consist of the most distinguished characters . . . and he thought such characters more likely to be selected by the State Legislatures, than in any other mode. (P. 112.)

Mr Pinkney thought the 2<sup>d</sup> branch ought to be permanent and independent; and that the members of it w<sup>d</sup> be rendered more so by receiving their appointment from the State Legislatures. This mode w<sup>d</sup> avoid the rivalships and discontents incident to the election by districts. (P. 119.)

Mason.

General government could not know how to make laws for every part — such as respect *agriculture* etc.

= particular governments would have *no defensive* power unless let into the constitution as a Constituent part — — —

It is impossible for one power to pervade the extreme parts of the U. S. so as to carry equal justice to them. (P. 120.)

The State Legislatures also ought to have some means of defending themselves ag<sup>t</sup> encroachments of the Natl Govl . . . And what better means can we provide than the giving them some share in, or rather to make them a constituent part of, the Natl Establishment. (*Ibid.*)

[June 8, 1787.]

Pinkney — For general Negative —

He urged that such a universality of the power [to negative all laws which they sh<sup>d</sup> judge to be improper] was indispensably necessary to render it effectual. (P. 121.)

Gerry — Is for a negative on paper emissions —

New States will arise which cannot be controuled — and may outweigh and controul —

Wilson — Foreign influence may infect certain corners of confederacy what ought to be restrained —

Union basis of our oppos and Ind[ependence]:

He had no objection to authorize a negative to paper money and similar measures. (P. 123.)

New States too having separate views from the old States will never come into the Union. They may even be under some foreign influence. (*Ibid.*)

### III. NOTES FOR JUNE 6 AND 8, 1787.

#### PRINCIPLES

I — Human mind fond of Compromise —

Maddisons Theory —

Two principles upon which republics ought to be constructed —

I that they have such extent as to render combinations on the ground of Interest difficult —

II By a process of election calculated to refine the representation of the People —

Answer — There is truth in both these principles but they do not conclude so strongly as he supposes —

— The Assembly when chosen will meet in one room if they are drawn from half the globe — and will be liable to all the passions of popular assemblies.

If more *minute links* are wanting others will supply them — Distinctions of Eastern middle and Southern states will come into view; between commercial and non commercial states — Imaginary lines will influence etc Human mind prone to limit its view by near and local objects —

Paper money is capable of giving a general impulse — It is easy to conceive a popular sentiment pervading the E. states —

Observe: large districts less liable to be influenced by factious demagogues than small —

Note — This is in some degree true but not so generally as may be supposed — Frequently small portions of the large districts carry elections — An influential demagogue will give an impulse to the whole — Demagogues are not always *inconsiderable* persons — Patricians were frequently demagogues — Characters are less known and a less active interest taken in them —

[June 8, 1787.]

Bedford —

Arithmetical calculation of proportional influence in General Government —

*Pensyl.* and *Delaware* may have rivalry in commerce — and influence of *Pens* — sacrifice *delaware*

If there be a negative in G G — yet if a law can pass through all the forms of S — C it will require force to abrogate it.

Butler — Will a man throw afloat his property and confide it to a government a thousand *miles distant*?

In this case Delaware would have about  $1/90$  for its share in the General Councils, whilst P<sup>s</sup> and V<sup>s</sup> would possess  $1/3$  of the whole. Is there no difference of interests, no rivalry of commerce, of manufactures? Will not these large States crush the small ones whenever they stand in the way of their ambitious or interested views . . . if a State does not obey the law of the new System, must not force be resorted to as the only ultimate remedy. (Pp. 125-126.)

#### IV. NOTES FOR JUNE 16 AND 19, 1787.

M<sup>r</sup> Lansing — N[ew] S[y]stem — proposes to draw representation from the whole body of people, without regard to S[tate] sovereignties —

Subs: proposes to preserve the State Sovereignties —

Powers — Different Legislatures had a different object —

— Revise the Confederation —

Ind. States cannot be supposed to be willing to annihilate the States —

State of New York would not have agreed to send members on this ground —

He was decidedly of opinion that the power of the Convention was restrained to amendments of a federal nature, and having for their basis the Confederacy in being. (P. 171.)

N. York would never have concurred in sending deputies to the Convention, if she had supposed the deliberations were to turn on a consolidation of the States, and a National Government. (Pp. 171-172.)

In vain to devise systems however good which will not be adopted —

If convulsions happen nothing we can do will give them a direction —

Legislatures cannot be expected to make such a sacrifice —

The wisest men in forming a system from theory apt to be mistaken —

The present national government has no precedent or experience to support it —

General opinion that certain additional powers ought to be given to Congress —

M<sup>r</sup>. Patterson — 1 — plan accords with powers

2 — accords with sentiments of the People —

If Confederation radically defective we ought to return to our states and tell them so —

Comes not here to sport sentiments of his own but to speak the sense of his Constituents —

— States treat[ed] as equal —

Present Compact gives one *Vote* to each state.

alterations are to be made by Congress and all the Legislatures —

All parties to a Contract must assent to its dissolution —

States collectively have advantages in which the smaller states do not participate — therefore individual rules do not apply —

— Force of government will not depend on proportion of representation — but on

Quantity of power —

— Check not necessary in a ge[n]eral government of communities — but

in an individual state spirit of faction is to be checked —

How have Congress hitherto conducted themselves?

The People approve of Congress but think they have not powers enough —

And it is in vain to propose what will not accord with these [sentiments of the people]. (P. 172.)

The Scheme is itself totally novel. There is no parallel to it to be found. (*Ibid.*)

. . . an augmentation of the powers of Congress will be readily approved by them. (*Ibid.*)

He preferred it because it accorded 1. with the powers of the Convention, 2 with the sentiments of the people. If the confederacy was radically wrong, let us return to our States, and obtain larger powers, not assume them ourselves. I came here not to speak my own sentiments, but the sentiments of those who sent me. (Pp. 172-173.)

. . . 5<sup>th</sup> art: of Confederation giving each State a vote — and the 13<sup>th</sup> declaring that no alteration shall be made without unanimous consent. . . . What is unanimously done, must be unanimously undone. (P. 173.)

Its efficacy will depend on the quantum of power collected, not on its being drawn from the States, or from the individuals. (P. 174.)

But the reason of the precaution [a check] is not applicable to this case. Within a particular State, where party heats prevail, such a check may be necessary. (*Ibid.*)

Do the people at large complain of Cong<sup>t</sup>? No, what they wish is that Cong<sup>t</sup> may have more



power. . . . With proper powers  
Cong<sup>s</sup> will act with more energy  
and wisdom than the proposed  
Nat<sup>l</sup> Legislature; being fewer in  
number. (Pp. 174-175.)

— body constituted like Con-  
gress from the *fewness* of their  
numbers more wisdom and en-  
ergy —

than the complicated system of  
Virginia —

— Expend enormous —

180 — commons

90 — senators

270 —

Wilson — Point of Disagreement —

V — N J —

1 2 or three One branch —  
branches —

2 Derives au-  
thority from from states —  
People —

3 Proportion of Equality —  
suffrage —

4 — Single Ex-  
ecutive — Plural —

5 — Majority to Minority to  
govern — govern —

6 — Legislate in partial ob-  
all matters jects —  
of general  
Concern —

7 Negative — None —

8 Removeable on application  
by impeach- of majority of  
ment — Executives.

9 — Qualified Nega-  
tive by Ex- None  
ecutive —

10 — Inf[er]ior.  
tribu- None —  
nals —

11 — Orig[inal]:  
Jurisdic-  
tion in all  
cases of None —  
Nat;  
Rev —

12. National Gov- to be ratified  
ernment to by Legisla-  
be ratified tures —  
by People —

. . . . You have 270, coming  
once at least a year from the most  
distant as well as the most central  
parts of the republic . . . can so  
expensive a System be seriously  
thought of? (P. 175.)

See pp. 175-176.

— Empowered to propose every thing P. 176.

to conclude nothing—  
— Does not think state govern- *Ibid.*  
ments the idols of the people—

Thinks a competent national government will be a favourite of the people—

Complaints from every part of United States that the purposes of government cannot be answered—

— In constituting a government — not merely necessary to give proper powers — but to give them to proper hands —

Two reasons against giving additional powers to Congress — *Ibid.*

— First it does not stand on the authority of the people —

Second — It is a single branch —

Inequality — the poison of all governments —

— Lord Chesterfield speaks of a Commission to be obtained for a member of a small province — P. 178.

Pinkney — P. 179.

M<sup>r</sup> Elsworth — *Ibid.*

M<sup>r</sup> Randolp[h] — Spirit of the People in favour of the Virginian scheme —

We have powers ; but if we had not we ought not to scruple — M<sup>r</sup> Randolph, was not scrupulous on the point of power. (*Ibid.*)

[June 19, 1787.]

Maddison — Breach of compact in one article releases the whole — A breach of the fundamental principles of the compact by a part of the Society would certainly absolve the other part from their obligations to it. (P. 210.)

Treaties may still be violated by the states under the Jersey plan — The proposed amendment to it [the existing Confederacy] does not supply the omission. (P. 212.)

appellate jurisdiction not sufficient because second trial cannot be had under it — . . . of what avail c<sup>d</sup> an appellate tribunal be, after an acquittal? (P. 213.)

Attempt made by one of the greatest monarchs of Europe to equalize the local peculiarities of It had been found impossible for the power of one of the most absolute princes in Europe (K. of

their separate provinces—in which the Agent fell a victim

France) directed by the wisdom of one of the most enlightened and patriotic Ministers (M<sup>r</sup> Neckar), etc. (P. 219.)

M<sup>r</sup> Pinckney<sup>1</sup> is of opinion that the first branch ought to be appointed in such manner as the legislatures shall direct —

Impracticable for general legislature to decide contested elections —

V. NOTES FOR JUNE 20, 1787.

M<sup>r</sup> Lansing — Resolved that the powers of legislation ought to be vested in the United States in Congress — — — — —

— If our plan be not adopted it will produce those mischiefs which we are sent to obviate —

Principles of system —

Equality of Representation —

Dependence of members of Congress on States —

So long as state distinctions exist state prejudices will operate whether election be by *states* or *people* —

— If no interest to *oppress* no need of *apportionment* —

— Virginia 16 — Delaware 1 —

— Will General Government have leisure to examine state laws — ?

— Will G Government have the necessary information ?

— Will states agree to surrender ?

— Let us meet public opinion and hope the progress of sentiment will make future arrangements —

— Would like my [Hamilton's] system if it could be established System without example —

M<sup>r</sup> Mason — Objection to granting power to Congress arose from their constitution.

M<sup>r</sup> Lansing . . . moved . . . "that the powers of Legislation be vested in the U. States in Congress." (P. 227.)

If it were true that such a uniformity of interests existed among the States, there was equal safety for all of them, whether the representation remained as heretofore, or were proportioned as now proposed. (P. 228.)

Is it conceivable that there will be leisure for such a task? (P. 229.)

Will the members of the General Legislature be competent Judges? (*Ibid.*)

<sup>1</sup> This note is on the same sheet as the notes for June 19, but has not been identified as belonging to that date.

*Sword and purse in one body—*

Two principles in which *America* are unanimous

1 attachment to Republican government

2 —to two branches of legislature —

— Military *force* and *liberty* incompatible —

— Will people maintain a standing army? —

— Will endeavour to preserve state governments and draw lines — trusting to posterity to amend —

M<sup>r</sup> Martin — General Government originally formed for the preservation of state governments —

Objection to giving power to Congress has originated with the legislatures —

10 of the states interested in an equal voice —

Real motive was an opinion that there ought to be distinct governments and not a general government —

If we should form a general government twould break to pieces — — —

— For common safety instituted a General gover[n]ment —

Jealousy of power the motive —

People have delegated all their authority to state governments —

Caution necessary to both systems —

Requisitions necessary upon one system as upon another —

In their *system* made requisitions necessary in the first instance but left Congress in the

Is it to be thought that the people of America . . . will surrender both the sword and the purse, to the same body . . . ? (Pp. 230-231.)

In two points he was sure it was well settled. 1. in an attachment to Republican Government.

2. in an attachment to more than one branch in the Legislature. (P. 231.)

The most jarring elements of Nature . . . are not more incompatible that[n] such a mixture of civil liberty and military execution. (P. 232.)

See pp. 232-233.

Gen<sup>l</sup> Gov<sup>t</sup> . . . was instituted for the purpose of that support [of the State Gov<sup>t</sup>]. (P. 233.)

. . . it was the Legislatures not the people who refused to enlarge their powers. (*Ibid.*)

. . . otherwise ten of the States must always have been ready, to place further confidence in Cong<sup>s</sup> (*Ibid.*)

. . . people of America preferred the establishment of themselves into thirteen separate sovereignties instead of incorporating themselves into one. (*Ibid.*)

See pp. 233-234.

. . . people of the States having already vested their powers in their respective Legislatures, etc. (P. 234.)

second instance to assess themselves—

Judicial tribunals in the different states would become odious — — —

If we always to make a change shall be always in a state of infancy —

~~the~~ States will not be disposed hereafter to strengthen — the general government.

Mr Sherman — Confederacy carried us through the war — —

Non compliances of States owing to various embarrassments

Why should state legislatures be unfriendly?

State governments will always have the confidence and government of the people: if they cannot be conciliated no efficacious government can be established.

Sense of all states that one branch is sufficient —

If consolidated all treaties will be void.

State governments more fit for local legislation customs habits etc

. . . would be viewed with a jealousy inconsistent with its usefulness. (*Ibid.*)

Cong<sup>s</sup> carried us thro' the war. (*Ibid.*)

. . . much might be said in apology for the failure . . . to comply with the Confederation. (P. 235.)

. . . saw no reason why the State Legislatures should be unfriendly. (*Ibid.*)

In none of the ratifications is the want of two branches noticed or complained of. (P. 236.)

To consolidate the States . . . would dissolve our treaties. (*Ibid.*)

Each State like each individual had its peculiar habits usages and manners. (*Ibid.*)

#### VI. NOTES, PROBABLY FOR DEBATE OF JUNE 26, 1787.

I Every government ought to have the means of self preservation

II — Combinations of a few large states might subvert

II — Could not be abused without a revolt

II Different genius of the states and different composition of the body

NOTE. Senate could not desire [?] to promote such a class

III Uniformity in the time of elections —

Objects of a Senate

To afford a double security against Faction in the house of representatives

Duration of the Senate necessary to its Firmness

Information

sense of national character

Responsibility

2. *Some Papers of Franklin Pierce, 1852-1862.*

(First Installment.)

The following letters were found among the private papers and correspondence of President Franklin Pierce. For access to these papers and permission to publish such as are here presented grateful acknowledgments are due to the custodian of the originals, Hon. Kirk D. Pierce, nephew of President Pierce, an able and well-known lawyer residing in Hillsboro, N. H., the early home of the President. The letters were copied, edited, and contributed to the REVIEW by P. O. Ray, Instructor in History and Political Science of the Pennsylvania State College.

I. EDMUND BURKE<sup>1</sup> TO FRANKLIN PIERCE (UNSIGNED COPY).

Confidential.

WASHINGTON, April 9, 1852.

*My dear Sir:*

I came to this city about one fortnight ago on business connected with patents, now pending in Congress. And since I have been here I have had very considerable opportunity to learn the sentiments of politicians in relation to the next Democratic nomination for the Presidency. The three prominent candidates for the nomination are Cass, Buchanan, and Douglass. Gen. Cass I think now has most friends although it seems to be the general impression that he can not get two-thirds of the Convention. Next to him Douglass is the most prominent. He has a good share of the Northwest to back him. After the Indiana delegation has given one vote for Gen. Lane they will go in for Douglass. So Wm. R. Brown tells me who is one of the Delegates at large. Tennessee and a portion of the Kentucky Delegation I understand will early come in to the support of Douglass. On the other hand, Mr. Buchanan seems to have but very little support out of Pennsylvania. Therefore, the struggle will be between Cass and Douglass. The old experienced politicians here are of the opinion that it will result in the defeat of both. Then of course the Convention will have to look about for a candidate among those who are not candidates directly for the nomination. Among these are Marcy, Dickinson, Butler, and Lynn Boyd, who are talked of. The two first will not unite the vote of N. Y., although the latter is very popular at the South. Gen. Butler a high-toned chivalrous and sound man seems to be under a cloud here in consequence of the fact that Benton

<sup>1</sup>See Appleton's *Cyclopædia of American Biography*. Burke had served several terms in the House as a representative from New Hampshire, and had been Commissioner of Patents from 1846 to 1850. Shortly after Pierce's inauguration Burke became a bitter enemy of the administration, often attacking its policy in the columns of the *New Hampshire State Capitol Reporter*. So bitter was his assault upon Douglas and the administration at the time when the Nebraska Bill was pending in Congress, that Douglas replied in a long letter, which appeared in the columns of the *New Hampshire Patriot and State Gazette* (Concord), the organ of the administration in that state.

Blair, and that class of politicians put him forward. I do not think it possible for him to survive this prejudice, and therefore I think that the *N. H. Patriot* has been too fast in putting him forward. Out of Ky. he seems to be the choice of nobody except the freesoilers of N. Y., and perhaps of Judge Bright of Indiana. And Lynn Boyd is not now a formidable candidate.

Now in my judgment if at the proper time at the Convention you will allow your name to be used as a compromise candidate, you stand as good a chance of the nomination as any man I can now think of.

In casual conversation I have asked southern gentlemen how you would suit the South and they have invariably responded most favorably. I am boarding with Col. Barbour, President of the late Virginia Democratic Convention, and he says the South would cordially unite on you. He tells me that a majority of the Convention was for Buchanan in preference to Cass or Douglass. There is another very intelligent gentleman boarding with me from Florida, by the name of Blunt. Mr. Atherton<sup>1</sup> knows him. I believe he is a Whig. But he says that no Northern man would be more generally acceptable than yourself to the South. I have also talked with Floyd, M. C., from New York and he says both of the Democratic factions in that State would unite upon you. Hence I believe that you are among the very probable candidates for the Presidency, if you will allow your name to be used at the right time.

But I must say frankly that you have not been quite free enough with your friends in relation to this subject. I can not learn as anyone knows what you would do or consent to have others do in reference to the nomination. You hold out the idea that there is no office you will again accept. Unless your determination never to accept of *any office* is irrevocable, I think you should say that you place your destinies so far as the Presidency is concerned in the hands of your friends.

I do not of course think it prudent to put you forward as a candidate for the Presidency until the three prominent candidates are first disposed of. If they shall all be defeated in the Convention, then your name should be put forward as a compromise candidate.

You will see by the proceedings in the House (which will be followed up in the Baltimore Convention) that our ticket has got to be *entirely clear of freesoilism*. The very general idea that the N. Y. freesoilers, Rantoul, Cleaveland, and others, hope to regain position in the Democratic party by the election of Butler, kills off all his prospects. Therefore, in my firm belief the *Patriot* has started off in a wrong track.

I shall be here until the 1st of May I think. I see our client Brown has run away.

Yours truly,

[EDMUND BURKE.]

Gen. F. Pierce.

<sup>1</sup> Charles G. Atherton, of New Hampshire, author of the "Gag Resolution". See V, Burke to Pierce, June 6, 1852, p. 114.



## II. FRANKLIN PIERCE TO EDMUND BURKE (UNSIGNED COPY).

CONCORD, Apl. 13, 1852.

*My dear Sir :*

I received your letter of the 9th inst. last night and desire without delay to acknowledge it with my thanks. I am quite surprised that you should speak of my not having been free enough with my friends upon the subject of your letter. I wrote to Atherton as I thought and felt.<sup>1</sup> What more had I apparently to say? Judging from what you say and what others have written within the last fortnight, the aspect of things has materially changed. The writing of that letter was a source of much dissatisfaction to my personal friends. But I deemed it a matter [of duty?] as things then presented themselves one of which I alone could judge. My heart was full of gratitude to my State as it had been many times before, to overflowing but it was at the same time more full of devotion to the party and I did not believe that N. H. or the National party had anything to gain by having my name in the list of aspirants. If you and my other discreet friends think (without reference to me personally) that the pride of our State, the success of the cause can be subverted by the use of my name then you must judge for me in view of all the circumstances. I wrote yesterday to my old friend French,<sup>2</sup> but hope he will confer with you and Norris<sup>3</sup> and Hibbard<sup>4</sup> and Peaslee<sup>5</sup>. I said to him in a hurry but more and more fully than I can say here. I must leave the matter to my friends at W. looking, as I am sure they will, to what is my duty and what may be the best interests of the party.

It is now 1 o'clock at night and I am in the midst of an important trial. Our client Brown ran discreetly. Write me as soon as you receive this.

Your friend

Hon. Edmund Burke,  
Washington, D. C.

[FRANKLIN PIERCE.]

P. S. I keep no copy and wish you would forward me one for I may need it in coming time. While I leave myself to my friends, they would desire me to keep my record clear, even if I had no such desire myself.

Tuesday night, 2 o'clock.

<sup>1</sup> At a ratification meeting held at Concord, June 10, 1852, Colonel John H. George of Concord is reported to have said: "On the 8th of January last the Democratic State Convention of New Hampshire unanimously presented the name of General Franklin Pierce to the people of the nation as a candidate for the highest office in its gift. . . Immediately after the action of the last State Convention, General Pierce wrote his letter to Mr. Atherton declining to be a candidate for the Presidency and declaring that the use of his name in any event before the Democratic National Convention would be utterly repugnant to his tastes and wishes. . ." See the *Patriot and Gazette* (Concord), June 16, 1852.

<sup>2</sup> Probably William H. French, aide-de-camp on General Pierce's staff during the Mexican War.

<sup>3</sup> Moses Norris, Jr., U. S. senator from New Hampshire.

<sup>4</sup> Harry Hibbard, a representative from New Hampshire.

<sup>5</sup> Charles H. Peaslee, representative from New Hampshire, 1847-1853.

III. EDMUND BURKE TO FRANKLIN PIERCE.

BALTIMORE, June 5, 1852.

*Dear General.*

We are in great hopes of nominating you this morning. The thing is about ripe. We have intimations from the delegations from Pennsylvania and Virginia that they will soon lead off for you. The South will come in, so will Maine, Conn, and I think all N. E. Michigan will also. The prospects are more encouraging than ever.

But you know the whole thing is contingent. So do not be too much elated. If God and the people give you the nomination and election, bear your honors calmly, meekly and with dignity. I have no doubt you will. You know I do not express opinions without a careful survey of the facts of the case. But in the opinion I now express I may be mistaken. We are all excited here and probably I may be more than usual.

The convention is about to work. Adieu. In haste,

Yours truly,

EDMUND BURKE.

IV. EDMUND BURKE TO FRANKLIN PIERCE.

BALTIMORE, June 5, 1852.

Afternoon.

*Dear General.*

I wrote you this morning that in all probability you would be nominated, and I said, if God and the people nominated and elected you, you must wear the transcendent honor with calmness, meekness and dignity, as becoming a true man and a Christian. I have no doubt you will. We have all done the best we could for you. We have pledged you to nothing except that you would be honest, faithful, true, discreet and just. We have no doubt you will fulfill all these pledges we have made for you.

The scene in the convention was grand—sublime. The cannon has already heralded your success. Mighty destiny, be true to it.

Gov. Dickinson tells me that New York will give you her vote by 30,000. The enthusiasm is tremendous. You unite all cliques.

Now your biography must be written. Send me the materials at Washington and I will prepare it for you. I have made arrangements already with Dr. Hebbé, the author of the *Universal History*, a man of great talent and distinction and great influence with the German population, to undertake and publish it at once in that language. [Name illegible] another German, will take the stump for you. I know these men well. They can do more for you with the foreign population than all others.

I think I can serve you best by remaining at Washington a few days. I know men from every state in the Union. *You will be elected.*

Yours truly,

EDMUND BURKE.

F. Pierce.

## V. EDMUND BURKE TO FRANKLIN PIERCE.

BALTIMORE, June 6, 1852.

*Dear General.*

I suppose by this time you have heard of the result of the deliberations of the National Democratic Convention and have become "calm as a summer's morning". I think we did right in putting King on the ticket. You know he is Buchanan's bosom friend and thus a great and powerful interest is conciliated. Our nominations also please both wings of the Democratic party in New York. They were content with slaying each other and both will cordially unite on you. If Scott is nominated the great battle-ground will be in New York and Pennsylvania. The slave states will fall into our laps like ripe apples. I think your election is certain but I remember while I express my opinion, that all things pertaining to humanity are uncertain and therefore you upon whom the great honor has fallen must not be too elated or sanguine. You must prepare yourself for the result, whatever it may be. I think you will be elected because all cliques of the democracy are united on you as they were on Mr. Polk.

I wrote you to send your minutes for a biography. It is wanted immediately. Perhaps I may not be able to stay at Washington long enough to prepare it and perhaps you may not desire that I should do it. If not, Gen. Peaslee will do it well and I will see Dr. Hebbé and tell him to translate it at once into German. I am anxious to get home to Concord on account of a certain event. May it not be best to postpone the election of Senator until fall? If you are elected will you not then desire the election of your own first choice among the candidates? In that event would not Mr. Atherton<sup>1</sup> be the best man for you in that body, through whom the administration can speak? In the event of your election I, or one of the candidates, shall be glad to defer to your wishes. I have no doubt the Democratic members of the Legislature will now so far consult your wishes as to postpone the election, if you desire it.

I shall remain a few days at Washington on business at the Patent and Pension offices, and while I am here I will do all I can to arrange things for the coming campaign.

*I am in correspondence with Kossuth* and through Dr. Hebbé can do something with the foreign population. Kossuth has great influence with them and will naturally suppose *without any assurance* that a northern administration will sympathize more with the popular movement in Europe than a southern or Whig administration. Kossuth should be invited to New Hampshire, but should receive nothing from you but courtesies and civilities. I am also acquainted with the editor of the leading German paper in the United States and have promised to see

<sup>1</sup> Charles G. Atherton, reelected to the Senate in November, 1852. Died November, 1853.

him on my return home through New York. We can do much through these channels. I expect to see you soon.

In haste yours truly,

EDMUND BURKE.

Gen. F. Pierce.

VI. EDMUND BURKE TO FRANKLIN PIERCE.

Confidential.

Hon. Franklin Pierce,

WASHINGTON, June 8, 1852.

*My dear Sir.*

I write to-day in relation to a matter personal to ourselves. Mr. Houston, Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means told me yesterday that he had been informed on good authority, that you were hostile to me, in fact, my enemy. When I was here in April last, I had a letter from a gentleman in New Hampshire informing me of the same fact and that the cause of it was some article in the *Argus* and *Spectator*; and in consequence you were opposed to my election to the Senate. Before receiving this letter, I had written to you my first letter in relation to your prospects for the Presidential nomination and received your reply; and the frankness and confidence expressed in the latter, led me at once to treat the intimation I had received as an idle rumor. Immediately after an intimate friend and relation of the gentleman who first wrote me, addressed a letter to me informing me that it was a mistake, and that you were not unfriendly to me. But the intimation from the Chairman of the *Committee of Ways and Means*, upon which I had supposed there was one of my personal friends from N. H. leads me to suspect that some one has not understood your relations with me and has given a wrong impression in regard to them; or that I have myself misunderstood the true spirit which has dictated your letters to me, as well as our personal interview at Newport. I believe that you have been misrepresented to Mr. Houston. But however it may be, I have no doubt you will have the frankness to say honestly and truly what your sentiments toward me are. If they be even as Mr. Houston has been informed, it will make no difference in the humble support I shall give to your nomination. I shall do all in my humble power to secure your election. That I owe to the great cause to which I have always been attached. But it may make some difference in the course I ought to pursue to accomplish that very object. It is more than probable that I shall be fixed upon to assume the editorial work of the *Union*<sup>1</sup> newspaper during the canvass. I seem to be the almost unanimous choice of our party in Congress for that position. But the consciousness that we are not friends, and that I was aiding to elevate my personal enemy to the White House, might dampen my ardor in the conflict, although I should do my best to prevent it. These considerations, if they are founded in fact, would render it very improper for

<sup>1</sup> *The Washington Union* (daily). See VIII, Pierce to Burke, June 14, 1852, p. 117. Burke was campaign editor of the *Union* during the late summer and autumn of 1852.

me to take charge of the *Union*. The heart of the editor of that paper should go into the conflict with no secret sadness nor grief.— But for the good of our cause, which *must* triumph in this contest, I should not be the editor of the *Union* if our relations are really such as have been intimated to me since I have been in this city.

From the first moment I saw the prospect dawning for you, I have done my utmost to accomplish the great result. Your nomination was effected precisely as I supposed it must be if at all. I never had but one opinion about it. But I claim no credit to myself in bringing about this result. All your friends from N. H. did all in their power to accomplish it. My extensive acquaintance with the politicians of the Union gave me, perhaps, some advantage over other of your friends. There was not a delegation in the Convention in which there were not more or less members with whom I was acquainted. I have a pretty extensive acquaintance with leading German politicians, and editors, both native and naturalized. These were of some benefit to us, and I shall avail myself of this acquaintance to bring the foreign vote so far as possible to the support of our cause.

And finally whatever may be said and done by jealous and rival politicians in N. H. their calumnies cannot shake my standing with the Democracy of the Union. Most of them will have to work hard as I have done before they attain to the same position before the country at large. I have been free and full in this letter. For your good and that of our cause we ought to know how we stand in relation to each other, in order that I may not get into any position which will in the remotest degree affect unfavorably our great cause, which *must* now triumph, or it will fall not to rise again for a quarter of a century.

Your nomination is received with great enthusiasm. It unites all factions of our party and seems to inspire every one with confidence in our success.

I am, very truly your friend etc,

EDMUND BURKE.

Gen. F. Pierce.

#### VII. EDMUND BURKE TO FRANKLIN PIERCE.

WASHINGTON, June 10, 1852.

*My dear Sir:*

Yesterday Mr. Ritchie<sup>1</sup> placed in my hands a letter from Robert G. Scott, Esq., of Richmond in relation to your answer to his letter addressed to the different Presidential candidates. I handed the letter to Gen. Peaslee to be communicated to you in the belief that it might be of some use to you in framing your reply to the letter of the committee appointed to inform you of your nomination.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Ritchie, editor of *The Washington Union*.

<sup>2</sup> This committee consisted of J. S. Barbour, J. Thompson, Alpheus Field, and Pierre Soulé. The letter of notification referred to is still in existence.

The western men are also a little alarmed in consequence of your votes upon the River and Harbor appropriations while in Congress, which the *Republic* newspaper has collected and published. Perhaps this is a matter which it would be expedient for you to consider in your reply. The western men think the Whigs will argue to the people that you will veto *all* bills whatever for the improvement of Harbors and Rivers, which would make your election an uphill business in the West. On the other hand some western members, including Douglass and Richardson of Illinois and Dunham of Indiana, think it will not hurt you at all.

But those who think it will injure you in the West, say that if in your reply to the Committee you could in some general phraseology say that you entered public life during the eventful administration of Gen. Jackson whose principles you have ever maintained, referring to his course upon Internal Improvements, but finally coming down upon the Baltimore platform, as your true position, it would be well. They say they can stand up to a man to the principles of Gen. Jackson on that subject, but they cannot fully to the doctrine of Mr. Polk's veto message. You can and will weigh these matters carefully and deliberately and make such reference to them as you deem expedient or none at all.

The ratification meeting in this city last night was the largest I ever saw here. Messrs. Cass, Houston, Lane, Davis and others spoke. Father Ritchie<sup>1</sup> made a few remarks. These facts show that our party are thoroughly united and determined to win.

By judicious management all the foreign populations can be brought to your support. Dr. Hebbé the distinguished Swedish scholar, left for N. York yesterday to address the German societies in that city. He has also written to many of the leading German editors in Pennsylvania and elsewhere. And this morning I received a prospectus for a new paper in the Welsh language to be published in Pottsville, Pa. It will be the first one in the United States. It is endorsed by Hon. F. W. Hughes, Secretary of State for Pennsylvania.

Yours truly,

EDMUND BURKE

Hon. Franklin Pierce.

VIII. FRANKLIN PIERCE TO EDMUND BURKE (COPY).

CONCORD N H

June 14, 1852<sup>2</sup>

*My dear sir :*

I returned from my journey to-day and hasten to answer your letter of June 8th wh I found an hour since among a large package awaiting my arrival.

In the first place I should like to know Mr Houston's authority. But without that, I will proceed to set matters right so far as we are con-

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Ritchie of the *Union*.

<sup>2</sup> Either this letter, or the reply of Burke (IX), perhaps each, is misdated. The error, however, is one of only a few days.

cerned. I can state distinctly, that the charge that I am yr. enemy has, so far as I know, no foundation in any act or word of mine. I had heard prior to the receipt of your letter in April that you were evidently unfriendly to me, and that if I desired to be brought before the National Convention, my first object should be to conciliate you. I uniformly replied, 1st, That I did not seek to be a candidate; 2d. That if it were otherwise, I would not turn on my heel to conciliate any man; and 3d. That I could not conceive that you were hostile, because I had always understood our relations to be of a friendly character. Your letter of April assured me that I had not misjudged and I supposed that we understood each other.

When I was informed of the controversy between yourself and Mr. Butterfield,<sup>1</sup> I expressed my deep regret, but was determined not to be in any way involved in it. I have not read the articles on either side, but I heard your first article freely commented on, and stated that if you had made a general assault upon the politicians of Concord, charging them with being under the influence of corporations and desiring to dictate to other parts of the State, such charges were groundless and unjustifiable, and in this I think few true men would differ with me. You have never been assailed by me. No act or word of mine justifies the charge. Now for the authority! What is charged and by whom?

I have received several letters from different gentlemen in relation to the "*Union*"<sup>2</sup> and matters connected therewith. As I understand the matter, it is a subject about which it would be neither politic nor just for me to speak. The democratic party have nominated me. They have presented a platform upon which I am willing to stand. I would not presume to enlarge or narrow it. The manner in wh., and the instrumentality through which, the nomination is to be sustained, must be left entirely to others. I shall not attempt to control, nor shall I, as at present advised, permit myself even to suggest.

I thank you for your frankness. It is the only way to maintain proper relations between friends personal or political.

Your friend,

FRANK PIERCE.

IX. EDMUND BURKE TO FRANKLIN PIERCE.

WASHINGTON, June 14, 1852.

Hon. Franklin Pierce

*My dear Sir,*

I have deferred answering your letter of the 14th inst. until I could see Mr. Houston and learn from him the author of the intimation which he made to me and to which I referred in my letter of the 8th inst. I have not been able to see him until to-day, and I made enquiry of him in relation to the matter. He says he can not now recall to mind the per-

<sup>1</sup> Editor of the *New Hampshire Patriot and State Gazette*, published at Concord.

<sup>2</sup> See VI, Burke to Pierce, June 8, 1852, p. 115.



son from whom he derived the impression that we were not on friendly terms. He says he and several other gentlemen were discussing the propriety of my taking the editorial charge of the Union newspaper when some one remarked that it might not be agreeable to you for we were opposed to each other in our State politics. Mr. Houston says it was from this remark that he got the impression which he stated to me. But it is now of no account. Your letter leaves no ground for me to doubt that our personal relations are now, as they have always been, friendly. I am aware that it was unnecessary for you to court the favor of any man — a more fortunate position than that in which most men are placed — but I have never acted in bad faith with regard to your nomination. I wrote you fully and frankly from this city in April last, what I thought the condition of things was here. I expressed then, as I did after my return to New Hampshire by letter, and orally in our personal interview at Newport, my belief in the great probability of your nomination, and how it was to be brought about. And I steadily acted with that end in view. I knew it was not policy to bring you out as a candidate for the nomination at the outset, and that you could only be nominated as a compromise candidate, and in this our whole delegation, I believe, agreed and we acted accordingly. And, of course, you owe your nomination to no one of us, nor to any particular man, but to your own position and a fortunate combination of circumstances, the noble character of the Granite State having some little weight in the matter.

I am aware that the Concord people, and I count Mr. Butterfield among the foremost of them, circulated the story during the late session of the Legislature that I was opposed to your nomination to the last, and that it was made against my wishes and active opposition. This is a base calumny for which there is not one particle of foundation, and I have no doubt your sense of justice will induce you to correct it. At any rate, I intend that it shall be taken back by those who put it afloat. If I had been opposed to you in the critical period when a slight circumstance might have defeated you, humble as I am, if I had been so disposed, perhaps I might have accomplished it. I knew more men in that Convention than any other man from our State, and without vanity I think I may say that my standing with the Democracy of this nation is as good as that of any other delegate from N. H. If I had used the advantages which these circumstances gave me, at one time, possibly I might have had some influence on the result. They were all however used to promote your success, and not to prevent it. But enough on this point.

As to the quarrel between the Argus and Patriot, I understood from Mr. Baldwin, and now understand from yourself that you do not take part in it. I was glad to be thus assured of what I before believed was the truth about the matter.

As to the statements made in the first article in the Argus, I am not aware that they are untrue. The two leading statements are that Col. George did not carry the late election in N. H. as claimed by the Patriot; and that a portion of the Democrats of Concord were too much connected

with corporations, and gave their countenance to corporate influence. Those statements were not published in the *Argus* until they had first been shown to leading democrats out of Sullivan Co. who concurred in them. I believe them to be true, and I stand by the truth without fear or favor from any man. If the records of various corporations at Concord and the history of our past legislature does not bear out what I say, then I will retract, but there is no power on earth that will make me retract what I believe to be true. I know a great many of the soundest and best democrats in New Hampshire concur with the *Argus* and with myself in this belief. The *Argus* has sustained in this controversy precisely the same principles which it sustained fifteen years ago, when it had the cordial support and encouragement of yourself and your venerated father. It has not changed on this matter of corporations. It did not move or change when the Patriot, and a large portion of the Democratic Party gave way on the Wilmot Proviso. And it will stand by its principles and flag, if it stands alone, no matter by whom it may be denounced. But I have dwelt longer on this topic than I intended.

Before this reaches you, you will have learned that Gen. Scott has been nominated. The nomination of Graham, with the platform, will generally unite the Whigs of the South. I think, with Gen. Scott's great and undisputed military services, it will require some effort on the part of the Democracy to beat him. I am afraid our friends have been all too confident of success. They seem to take it for granted that we are to carry the election. I cannot learn that they are doing much. They are not going into the combat with the promptness and energy which the occasion demands. I do not think our Central Executive Committee is made up of the right sort of men. Robert McLane of Baltimore is Chairman. He is a man of talents, but I think he has not the industry nor the practical experience necessary for getting up good political tracts. Dr. Gwin is also a man of ability and good sound sense, but he has too much California business to attend to. And Messrs. Edgerton and Penn [?] of the House, are neither of them the right sort of men for such duties as will devolve on the Executive Committee. Ten days ago I placed in the hands of the Committee a proposition with regard to the establishment of a Welsh paper in Pottsville, Pa. I had secured a letter from Col. Hughes, Secretary of State of Pennsylvania, with regard to the subject, and also communications from other gentlemen of that State. I supposed the matter would be attended to, but so far from that, on Monday last Mr. Penn [?] told me the *Committee had not organized*. Our friends here seem to think the battle is to be won without fighting.

I have had some opportunity to observe the effect of Scott's nomination, and am satisfied that it will very generally unite the Whig party. Many of the delegates from the South are now in the city, and I find that the adoption of a platform and the nomination of Graham has removed their objections to Scott, and all those Whig politicians in Congress, who have not so far committed themselves against Scott that they cannot honorably back out, will go in for him. I understand Gen. Dawson of

Ga. has already given in his adhesion. I am satisfied that the Whig party will be united under Scott and that with his unquestionably great military reputation and long public service he will be a hard candidate to beat. Therefore I think it is time for our party to lay aside the delusion that we are to gain an easy victory, and make up our minds for one of the hardest contests we have ever had. I believe we shall be successful if we fight the battle as we ought. If we do not we shall be beaten.

I dined in company with Mr. Soule and other gentlemen yesterday. Mr. S. spoke of his interview with you, and in the most complimentary terms of yourself. I think he was most agreeably disappointed. Col. Barbour also was highly delighted with his acquaintance with you. Both he and Mr. Soule not only spoke most favorably of your deportment as a gentleman, but of your unblemished character and your knowledge of public affairs. I think it was very well that the Committee<sup>1</sup> visited you in person.

I have mentioned the name of Dr. Hebbé to you in former letters. His connection with and great influence over the foreign population, make it important to have him take the right course in this election. He is a Swede, by birth, and a man of profound learning and high character. He was educated in Germany and was expelled that country on account of his liberal principles. He is intimate with Kossuth, and other distinguished characters engaged in the European popular movements. He is a thorough and philosophical democrat and espouses our side from a conviction of its intrinsic merits. He has succeeded in bringing out several leading German papers in support of our nominations, which took a neutral position in consequence of Cass' defeat. He has also been to New York and addressed the foreign trade societies in that city urging upon them the support of our ticket. And being by birth a Scandinavian he desires to go through Iowa, Wisconsin, and other States of the West in which most of the Swedes, Norwegians and Danes reside, and address them before the election. He will also during the summer make you a visit, in order that he may speak to his countrymen of his personal knowledge of you. Mr. Fleischmann, a German, who was my principal draughtsman in the Patent Office, and recently consul at Wurtemberg, a man also of very great learning and attainments, has also assured me that he will stump it through the German regions. He will also visit you this summer for the same reason assigned by Dr. Hebbé. The grand ideas which are to be most potent in this election are sympathy for the liberals of Europe, the expansion of the Republic southward and westward and the grasping of the magnificent [prize? illegible] of the commerce of the Pacific — in short the ideas of which the term 'Young America' is the symbol. Both Hebbé and Fleischmann and Mr. Soule and the young men of the Republic have these ideas moving them deeply.

As to the subject suggested in my letter by [illegible] Mr. French has written a sketch of your life which he read to Mr. Hubbard and myself

<sup>1</sup> See VII, Burke to Pierce, June 10, 1852, p. 116, note 2.

before he sent it away to be published. It was very well, but not sufficiently full and strong on some points. There is also a sketch of your life for sale at the book stores prepared, I understand, by Lester of New York. That is too expensive. We want a strong pointed biography in pamphlet form to be widely circulated by members of Congress. And we want also a good likeness of you. None has yet appeared. If you had sent me a daguerreotype engravings from it would have been on sale ten days ago. We want a biography to be translated into German. As I shall leave the city as soon as I can close up some business at the Patent Office I shall not now have time to attend to any of these matters. Pardon me this very long letter and believe me

ever yours truly,

EDMUND BURKE.<sup>1</sup>

X. G. C. HEBBÉ TO EDMUND BURKE.

Honorable Ed. Burke.

WASHINGTON CITY July 15th 1852.

*Dear Sir*

I have many times already had great reasons to wish that you had remained here and lent your energy to the Central Committee which acts with deplorable imbecility. It was a great misfortune that you did not become a member of that Committee, and a no less one that you are not Editor of the Union. I have had several conferences with Dr. Gwin and Hon Mr. Senn [Penn?], but the committee has not yet collected so much money that it has dared to grant aid to those papers which I have recommended to its patronage. The Committee committed the blunder to order a Philadelphia paper to publish 25,000 copies in German of the life of General Pierce — when this order ought to have been given to Mr. Newman as recommended by myself — I told Mr. Penn yesterday that if Mr. Forney's advice is to be taken on such matters — the committee has to take upon themselves the responsibility of the consequences. The paper to which this order was given — is very influential in Pennsylvania —, but there is now much less hope to carry that State than New York — and consequently all ought to be done to secure the latter State — in which we have more hope to succeed — But it appears as the interests of certain individuals are to be promoted at hasard even to see the party defeated —

<sup>1</sup> Further information relating to the ante-convention movements which brought about Pierce's nomination is to be found in the files of the *Boston Daily Advertiser* (Whig) for November, 1853, and of the *Arkansas Whig* for December, 1853. These articles are based upon Burke's own story of how the "mysterious" nomination was effected, which appeared in the *State Capitol Reporter* (Concord) in October, 1853. For this paper, which was a violent anti-administration organ, Burke was for the time an editorial writer. Burke's story may also be found quoted in *The New Hampshire Statesman* (Concord) for October 29, 1853. In January, 1904, an article appeared in *The Minneapolis Journal* which sheds further light upon the nomination. The writer, a law-student in Concord in 1852, boarded in the same family with one Henry P. Rolfe, then a student in the law-office of Minot and Pierce, and bases his statements upon conversations taking place between himself and Rolfe on the day when the New Hampshire delegation left Concord for Baltimore.

I have had letters from Gen. Kossuth — in which he complains much of the deception which certain persons of the Democratic party have made themselves guilty of in regard to himself — and I have had the utmost difficulty in preventing him from taking steps which would undoubtedly have led to the disorganization and defeat of the Democratic party — I hope that General Pierce's letter to the Democrats of Philadelphia has satisfied Gen Kossuth at least to some degree — still I know that he expected from Gen. Pierce a still more explicit avowal in regard to the course of foreign policy which this country ought to pursue —, but I think, that the General could not say more in the present state of affairs

I have written an urgent appeal to the adopted citizens of Scandinavian birth to support General Pierce, and I hope that this appeal which appeared in the "*Skandinoven*" of last Saturday will have a good effect and give General Pierce at least 10,000 votes from that quarter.

I have also written about 35 letters to several German papers — and to English papers — urging upon the readers of these papers the necessity and duty to sustain the Democratic nominees — I intend to sail for Europe on Saturday from New York — but hope to return before the 1st of Sept. when I will have the honor to visit you and then begin to stump the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Wisconsin and Iowa — From Europe I will transmit several letters to papers in these States in order to advocate the success of our party —

I am a democrat at heart because I consider that party — notwithstanding its many defects as the only one which at present can do any practical good for the advance of freedom throughout the world — I am, however, sorry to see that the influence of the South is preponderant here in Washington — It is a great mistake to think that the South can accomplish the victory of the Democratic party — when on the contrary it is clear that the result will chiefly depend upon the votes of the northern and western states —, where the votes of the adoptive citizens are decisive —

I have from Gen. Kossuth that General Pierce has promised to visit New York — and I hope that he will do so — as such a visit would probably do much to influence the people of that State.

I hope that you will exercise all your energy in behalf of the Democratic party — as I am fully convinced that you can do much for the success of our cause in the present struggle — I should be very glad to hear from you before my departure — and I think that a letter addressed to me — care of Nicholas Day 74 Wall Street New York — would reach me before the departure of the steamer on Saturday.

I have the honor to remain with the most sincere regards,

Dear Sir

Yours most truly,  
G. C. HERBE.

In great haste.

XI. JAMES CAMPBELL TO ARTHUR S. NEVITT.<sup>1</sup>

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,  
March 1, 1856.

*Sir:*

I have thought it my duty to send you the enclosed copies of papers which have just been placed on file in this department. Not so much to satisfy myself upon any point made against you as to furnish the occasion for a statement calculated to satisfy all unprejudiced minds.

If there are persons in your office who sympathize with a political party hostile to the Democratic Party, and bound by secret oaths to principles contrary to the letter and spirit of the Constitution under which we live, you should know them and should neither employ them nor trust them.

I desire something more than a mere statement of your employees, that at a given time they do not belong to a Know-nothing organization. Have they been Know-nothings? Do they sympathize with that political organization? Is your chief clerk a Whig with Know-nothing sympathies? What was his action at the last election?

If you cannot answer these questions with confidence and satisfaction, changes must be made. Reformation in the office is due not only to the Department, but to yourself.

I wish you would answer promptly and fully.

I am, respectfully,

Your obt. servant,  
JAMES CAMPBELL.

Arthur S. Nevitt, Esq.,  
(P. M.) New Orleans, La.

XII. JOHN W. GEARY<sup>2</sup> TO FRANKLIN PIERCE.

Confidential.

Executive Department,  
LECOMPTON, Kansas Territory,  
December 22nd 1856.

His Excellency,  
Franklin Pierce, President.

*My Dear Sir:*

The removal of Donaldson,<sup>3</sup> Clark and LeCompte<sup>4</sup> has been received here with general acclamations by the people, and men recently disposed to vilify and abuse you are loud in your praise. None blame you except those interested in having certain crimes laid in oblivion.

It is my duty to speak frankly and honestly to you, and from time to time I have done so without prejudice, fear or favor. The Country

<sup>1</sup> This letter is apparently in Pierce's handwriting, but is signed in lead-pencil, "James Campbell", and addressed to Arthur S. Nevitt, Postmaster, New Orleans, La.

<sup>2</sup> Governor of Kansas Territory.

<sup>3</sup> J. B. Donaldson, U. S. marshal for Kansas Territory.

<sup>4</sup> Samuel D. LeCompte, Chief Justice of Kansas Territory.



should know, and if I live long enough, it shall know, that the censure which has been heaped upon your administration for mismanagement in Kansas affairs is not attributable to you, but is the consequence of the criminal complicity of public officers some of whom you have removed the moment you were clearly satisfied of their true position.

I could not have credited it, unless I had seen it with my own eyes, and had the most conclusive evidence of the fact, that public officers would have lent themselves to carry out schemes which at once set at naught every principle of right and justice upon which the equality and existence of our government is founded. You know that there is no man in the Union, that more heartily despises the contracted creed of the abolitionists than I do, or more clearly perceives the pernicious tendency of their doctrines, and on this question I trust I am an impartial judge. The persecutions of the free-state men here was not exceeded by those of the early christians. I am not their vindicator, and wish not to extenuate the numerous outrages committed by them, the perpetrators of which, in due time, I will endeavor to bring, as well as others, to condign punishment, but I do say that the men holding official position have never given you that impartial information on the subject so necessary to form correct conclusions, which your high position so imperatively demanded. I wish not to speak of the injudicious and criminal proceedings of some of the emigrant aid societies and of the fanaticism which called some of them into existence, there are persons better versed in the origin of these movements who can explain them better than myself, but occupying the confidential and official relations I do to yourself, which at your pleasure I am most willing to lay at your feet, it is necessary that I, especially, should do "equal and exact" justice to that side of the question.

Let us go back then to the origin of the Kansas difficulty and see what was the agitating cause, or causes, and let us candidly examine whether or not *our friends* were faultless.

From the most reliable information I am satisfied that there was a settled determination in *high quarters* to make this a Slave State *at all hazards*; that policy was communicated to agents here, and that most of the public officers sent here were secured for its success. The consequence was that when Northern emigrants came here at an early day, *even before* the emigrant aid societies began to excite public attention, that certain persons along the borders of Missouri began to challenge unexceptionable settlers, and finding many not for a slave state, they were subjected to various indignities, and told that this soil, which previous to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was devoted to freedom, did not belong to such as them, and *that they must settle in Nebraska*.

These immigrants, *highly conservative* in their character, excited by this unjust treatment, wrote back to their friends in the North and thus by a little indiscretion on the part of overzealous persons in Missouri a spark was ignited which nearly set the whole country in a flame. This virulent spirit of dogged determination to *force* slavery into this Terri-



tory, has overshot its mark and raised a storm which nothing but an honest return to the beneficent provisions of our Organic Act can quell. Lecompte, Donaldson, Clarke, Woodson<sup>1</sup>, CALHOUN<sup>2</sup> and Isaacs<sup>3</sup> were prominent actors in this fearful tragedy and willing tools to carry out this wicked policy. *They have therefore destroyed their public usefulness*, and their removal would be hailed with a tumult of joy by the entire population. But well do I appreciate your position in the matter and beyond your own sense of justice and propriety I would not desire you to go. Could it be done, it would restore you to that position in the popular affections which you so justly occupied at the period of your Inauguration.

I was much surprised and somewhat amused to learn to-day that Clark, the ex-agent, had just received a letter from Genl. Whitfield<sup>4</sup> in which the latter says that you told him that all the odium brought on your administration was the dire result of Clark's, Whitfield's, Atchison's,<sup>5</sup> Stringfellow's,<sup>6</sup> and others' indiscreet action. Why Whitfield would write thus when he owes his seat to you and me, I know not, but I am sure that *he never penned a greater truth*.

In your whole administration which has been remarkably eventful there is not a shadow of complaint except this Kansas Matter over which, with the dearth of reliable information, you could exercise little influence. Almost every public officer here, necessarily the channels of information, conspired to give you ex parte and prejudiced statements. It was natural and generous that you should believe men professing to be your friends in preference to others notoriously your enemies.

There is a plan in Westport, Mo. to invade the Territory with about 1000 men, to take possession of the "Shawnee Reserve", about the 20th of Feby. *The Indian agent lives there. Calhoun has been there 10 or fifteen days. Can't you blow this conspiracy out of water?*

On the Shawnee [*sic*] Reserve, after the Indians have made their selections, there will remain about 1500 quarter sections for preemption.

I thank you for the firm and prompt manner with which you have sustained my policy and seconded my suggestions in the removal of the men indicated, and I earnestly trust you will be seconded in the good work.

<sup>1</sup> Daniel Woodson, secretary of the territory under Reeder, acting governor upon Reeder's removal, secretary under Governor Shannon, and again acting governor upon Shannon's resignation.

<sup>2</sup> John Calhoun, surveyor-general of Kansas Territory. Instrumental in prejudicing the administration against Geary. See Rhodes, II, 239.

<sup>3</sup> Isaacs, U. S. district attorney for Kansas Territory. See Davis to Pierce, July 23, 1857, to appear in the REVIEW for January, 1905.

<sup>4</sup> J. W. Whitfield, elected Delegate to Congress by the pro-slavery party, November 29, 1854.

<sup>5</sup> David R. Atchison, previously senator from Missouri.

<sup>6</sup> B. F. Stringfellow, co-editor of the *Squatter Sovereign*, published at Atchison, Kansas, which professed to be the organ of the Washington government in western Missouri.

I can, and will with the aid of the National Govern't., make Kansas a model state, enriched with Democratic Institutions based upon the Constitution of the U. S., and blessed with all the rich treasures of learning, ennobled by virtue, intelligence and enterprise of the millions of freemen whom its exuberantly fertile soil is capable of supporting. After you have laid aside the cares of State, if I am called to remain here, I want you to give me the pleasure of a visit to Kansas. I will make a tour with you through the Territory. The salubrity of the climate, the beauty of the country and the warm reception I promise you from our generous people will compensate you for the trip.

With the assurance of my high regards I am devotedly your friend and obedient servant,

JNO. W. GEARY.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

*Introduction à la Doctrine de l'État.* By GEORGE JELLINEK, Professor of Law in the University of Heidelberg. Translated from the German by GEORGES FARDIS, Directeur des "Archives Diplomatiques". (Paris: Albert Fontemoing. 1904. Pp. viii, 223.)

PROFESSOR JELLINEK is among the first, if indeed he is not the first, of living writers in the field of political theory. In 1882 he published his *Die Lehre von den Staatenverbindungen*; in 1887, his *Gesetz und Verordnung*; in 1892, his *System der subjektiven öffentlichen Rechte*; and, finally, in 1900, his *Allgemeine Staatslehre*. This last is the first volume of a comprehensive work entitled *Das Recht des modernen Staates*, the production of which, as he says in his preface, has been due at once to his desire to present in the form of a systematic synthesis the results of previous monographic studies, and to his belief that there is needed a political treatise the form and method of which shall conform to the requirements of present political conditions. The first section of this first volume is devoted to the task of determining the problems and methods of political theory and to a statement of its relations to other departments of scientific inquiry. It is this section that is translated by M. Fardis under the title "Introduction to the Theory of the State". For some reason the title on the cover is that of the whole work, *L'État moderne et Son Droit*.

As appears from the foregoing, the work is purely political in character. It has, however, a direct interest to historians in so far as it considers the value of history and the historical method to the political scientist. The province of political science, when limited to the study of a particular state, says the author, is concerned with the discovery and description of average types (*types moyens — Durchschnittstypen*) as distinguished from ideal types. These average types are to be determined by induction, that is, by the comparative and historical methods. This methodological principle, though clear and simple in itself, is, however, one surrounded by great difficulty in application. This arises from the fact that, upon the one hand, there is the danger of so emphasizing likenesses as unduly to disregard individual characteristics, with the result that the type so determined corresponds to nothing that exists. This, asserts Jellinek, is the error into which have fallen all attempts to create a general science of comparative jurisprudence. Upon the other hand, when all of the special peculiarities of each political unit are considered, the general or average type cannot be made to appear. In order, then, to avoid these two opposite dangers, it is necessary for the political scientist to limit his investigation to political institutions which proceed

from the same civilization and rest upon a common historical basis. The results due to a disregard of this principle are seen when one attempts to compare antique with modern democracy, the absolutism of Roman emperors with that of monarchs of the present time, or the federal states of to day with those of ancient Greece. Coming more directly to the application of the historical method to the study of political types, the author's discussion centers around the necessity of distinguishing between the change of an institution into an entirely different thing and its modification, wherein it alters its form and some of its attributes, but still performs essentially the same political functions. In the former case the historical connection is, so to speak, purely an external one, and an attempt to analyze the character or interpret the functions of the later institution by the character and functions of the earlier is inappropriate and misleading. Thus, also, the study of institutions that have gone out of existence is of little or no practical value in the analysis of present political phenomena. Thus, without at all denying the intrinsic value of historical research, the author points out that in any attempt to analyze modern political types, the history of the past is valuable only in so far as it traces the development and thus serves to explain the nature of existing institutions. All else belongs to the domain of historical and political antiquities.

In the foregoing, the reviewer has limited himself to a notice simply of a single point. In justice to the author it should be said, however, that the work as a whole furnishes an excellent propædæutic to the study of the modern state, and the larger work of which it is a part must serve still further to enhance the already high reputation of its author. That the French rendering of the German original is well done is sufficiently attested by the name of the translator.

W. W. WILLOUGHBY.

*The Development of European Polity.* By HENRY SIDGWICK, late Professor at Cambridge. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1903. Pp. xxvi, 454.)

This book is the posthumous publication of the late Professor Sidgwick's lectures at Cambridge in the field of political science, and the place the work occupied in the author's mind is best stated in the words of the editor, Mrs. Sidgwick. He considered, she says,

That a threefold treatment of politics is desirable for completeness:—first, an exposition analytical and deductive, such as he attempted in his work on the *Elements of Politics*; secondly, an evolutionary study of the development of polity within the historic period in Europe, beginning with the earliest known Græco-Roman and Teutonic polity, and carried down to the modern state of Europe and its colonies as the last result of political evolution; thirdly, a comparative study of . . . what may be called the constitution-making century which has just ended. The

present book is an attempt at a treatment of political science from the second point of view.

To this may be added Sidgwick's own statement on pages 3-4 :

What I shall mainly attempt is to exhibit with their distinctive characteristics, to classify according to their most important resemblances, and to link together by the conception of continuous development, the principal forms of political society which the history of European civilisation manifests ; regarding them as stages in the historic process through which political society has passed, and of which the modern state, as we know it, is the outcome.

The book has not had the benefit of the author's final revision or even arrangement. It is proper to keep this in mind with respect both to defects in construction, and to features in the field of reference and bibliography that may not seem quite abreast with present-day requirements ; though when we find Robertson's *Charles the Fifth* cited for the views of Montesquieu, it may be suspected that the author had rather an old-fashioned view of his obligations in regard to sources. The book in general leaves the impression that he shared in the ordinary English inattention to the modern monograph (especially German), and was content for most of his historical information with the older general English writers. It is not to be inferred, however, that the stickler for cautious and accurate statement of historical facts will be frequently shocked ; on the whole he will perhaps be agreeably surprised, even though he may wish that it were not so positively declared that William the Conqueror scattered the lands of his followers of malice prepense, and though he may not be disposed to accept the strong statement of the close connection between the American and the French Revolutions.

After an introduction of eighty pages on governmental origins, about 100 pages are given to ancient history and 150 to the medieval period, leaving 125 for modern history. The work is unevenly done ; the whole modern part is sketchy, and while the medieval city structure is fully presented, medieval representative institutions are not. The diction is clear and forcible, and the analyses and descriptions are everywhere brought into close connection with historical fact. It bears the mark of the clear thinking, sound scholarship, and power of popularizing in the best sense that is associated with the already somewhat old-fashioned English school of which Seeley and Sidgwick were such good representatives. It is interesting to find that these two men were closely associated in their work at Cambridge ; the reader will be frequently reminded here of Seeley's ideas, especially in the part in which Sidgwick deals with modern English political development. It will be remembered that Seeley's *Introduction to Political Science* was also published posthumously and was prepared for publication by Sidgwick. This intellectual association must have been an attractive and stimulating one, and there is probably no propriety in ascribing to either one of the men an indisputably leading place.

The student of history who is occupied primarily with the state will

find much in this volume of suggestive interest. Particularly so are the passages in which Professor Sidgwick states his views of the respective scope of history and political science and of the relations between them. He discriminates between political philosophy, political science, and political history, but his reader will suspect that his discrimination is rather as to "points of view" (a term which he himself uses, p. 2) than with respect to clearly-defined and mutually exclusive fields of work. He rejects the idea "that the historical method is the one to be primarily used in attempting to find reasoned solutions of the problems of practical politics" (p. 4), and evidently would sympathize but little with the idea of a science of history. But perhaps some of those who would not quarrel with him for that might wish some changes of term in the following sentence (p. 141) in which he states most pointedly the differences he recognizes between history and political science:

The difference, generally speaking, between the scientific and the merely historical treatment of the forms of government and of political society which history presents to us, is that in history proper we are concerned primarily with particular facts, and only secondarily with general laws and types, causes and tendencies; whereas in Political Science we are concerned primarily with the general laws and types, and only with any particular fact as a part of the evidence from which our general conclusions are drawn.

VICTOR COFFIN.

*The Evolution of Modern Liberty.* By GEORGE L. SCHERGER, Ph.D.  
(New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1904. Pp.  
xiv, 284.)

THIS volume, the preface informs us, was originally intended by the author to be a study in the relation between the American and the French bills of rights. While at work on this task, Professor Jellinek's book, *Die Erklärung der Menschen- und Bürgerrechte* appeared, and Dr. Scherger widened the scope of his treatise to include a history of the evolution of modern liberty. In the first two parts of the book the author traces the development of the doctrines of natural law and popular sovereignty from antiquity to the French Revolution; in part III he discusses the American bills of rights; in part IV, the French Declaration; and the volume closes with a chapter on the effects of formal declarations of rights.

The first half of the volume is far from satisfactory. It is a difficult task to condense the history of liberty from the earliest to modern times into a small compass, and the author has not been successful in the attempt. He presents a careful and accurate digest of the opinions of a series of eminent political philosophers, but does not give anything like an adequate description of the great march of events leading up to what we call "modern liberty". Even the evolution of the theory of liberty, viewed as *Dogmengeschichte*, he has not clearly unfolded, while the conditions that make liberty possible and the specific political forms that

human freedom has assumed from time to time he has not attempted to discuss. This is a subject too vast in its extent to fit in easily as a preface to a discussion of modern bills of rights, and the attempt to include it has upset the equilibrium of the volume.

The second half of the book is an essay on the bills of rights in America and France. In this field the work of Dr. Scherger is good, and shows that he need not have been deterred by the previous appearance of Jellinek's volume from presenting his own study. A diligent enumeration of American political theories during the Revolutionary period is given, and also a very interesting résumé of the debates on the bills of rights proposed in the French Constituent Assembly. In agreement with Jellinek and in opposition to Boutmy, the author believes that the American declarations exercised great influence upon the French philosophers. He very properly calls attention to the fact that Rousseau's political theory did not admit of any guaranty of individual rights, and hence that a formal declaration was not regarded as necessary. Even Boutmy must admit that if the Americans did not teach the citizens of the sister republic the principles of the Declaration, at least they instructed them in the dramatic possibilities of such a pronouncement.

The style in which Dr. Scherger's volume is written leaves much to be desired. The method of paragraphing invites criticism and suggests the need of careful revision. The most serious fault, however, is the inarticulate and inorganic character of the narrative. The author displays a constant tendency to enumerate and catalogue the opinions of great thinkers without correlating, elucidating, or summarizing. This trait makes parts of Dr. Scherger's volume resemble an encyclopedia or book of reference rather than a representation of an evolutionary process.

On the whole, the digest of the French discussions on the Declaration of Rights is the most important part of the book. As a history of the evolution of modern liberty, the volume falls far short of the standard; but as a study of the relation between the American and the French bills of rights, it possesses meritorious features. It is unfortunate that the author did not adhere to his original plan and present merely a comparative study in declarations of rights.

C. E. MERRIAM.

*Manuel d'Histoire des Religions.* Par P. D. CHANTEPIE DE LA SAUSSAYE. Traduit sur la seconde édition allemande, sur la direction de HENRI HUBERT et ISIDORE LÉVY. (Paris: Armand Colin. 1904. Pp. liii, 714.)

THE second edition of Chantepie de la Saussaye's handbook of the history of religions appeared in 1897. A distinct advance upon the earlier edition of 1887, it contained much more that was historical and descriptive and much less that was problematical. In fact the phenomenology of the earlier edition was well-nigh rescinded, and the author contented himself with his real subject-matter, reserving all discussion of



religious origins for another publication. The present work is a good translation of this second edition, the two volumes of the original here appearing in one bulky octavo. Some matter has been suppressed, and in the way of bibliography some additions have been made, though they might easily have been rendered more complete. The chief addition, however, is an introduction of forty-four pages by M. Hubert, designed to give the reader a sketch of the chief modern schools and tendencies at work in the new study called the science of religion.

As M. Chantepie de la Saussaye's handbook in its revised form has been before the public for seven years, it will not be necessary to review at length this translation, which is practically the same matter in a garb useful for those ignorant of German. The slight changes already referred to are not sufficient to call for comment. As a historical review of religions, Saussaye's book is by far the best and most complete we possess, especially in the greater part, dedicated to historical religions, chapters three to thirteen, which embrace the religions of the Chinese, Japanese, Egyptians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Syrians, Phœnicians, Israelites, Mohammedans, Hindus, Persians, Greeks, and Romans. The author is a conservative historian and apt to question rather than to admit new views. In Persia, the influence of Babylon is as good as ignored, and Gruppe's view of Greek religion has not materially affected the exposition. For a manual this is a satisfactory point of view, and in the field of historical and literary religions there is no fault to be found with the amount of material. It is otherwise with the religions of Slavs, Germans, and Celts, all of whom are disposed of in one short chapter. Still more disappointing is the discussion of the religions of *les peuples dits sauvages*. Four or five pages suffice for these most important exponents of religious ideas, Greenlanders, Esquimaux, Redskins, Mexicans, and Peruvians! Similarly, the religion of the Australians is not brought up to date, though this is somewhat atoned for in the translator's introduction.

The long introduction of M. Hubert discusses first the bearing of symbolism, naturalism, and euhemerism on mythological exegesis. They are not all-explanatory; rather they each represent a period in the life of myths. The English-German anthropological school, in M. Hubert's opinion, deals too much with origins, not enough with functions. More satisfactory, in his view, is the French sociological school; but this has arisen too recently to achieve great results, though much is to be hoped for from its clarity of view. Religious facts are fundamentally social facts, produced necessarily in society when individual activity is conditioned by the common life. This is the viewpoint of the *Année Sociologique*. The introduction is apparently intended to make good the lack of discussion in Saussaye's second edition. The book as a whole scarcely needs a recommendation. Owing to its acknowledged excellence, it has been a standard work for years. In its new shape it will doubtless win fresh readers, and it is to be hoped that so important a manual may eventually be rendered into English.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

*The History of the World: a Survey of Man's Record.* Edited by Dr. H. F. HELMOLT. Vol. II, Eastern Asia and Oceania—the Indian Ocean. (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company. 1904. Pp. xviii, 642.)

THE present volume, conceived as it is upon "ethnogeographical" principles, shares the general characteristics of the other volumes of this work that have already appeared. Again the main difficulty is seen to consist, not so much in the principle of writing a history of the world from the standpoint of ethnography and geography, as of so harmonizing, in one connected narrative, the conclusions of these sciences with the natural sequence of historical development, as to reduce the inevitable repetitions and anticipations into the smallest possible extent. It is, for instance, not until one has read all of Japan and much of China in this volume that he begins to comprehend some obscure points about the former country, while many an important question of Chinese history is in turn reserved for the following section on Central Asia. To India, also, we come only after we have read much of the moral influence which emanated from it and, in addition, have gone through Siberia, Australia, and Oceania.

Another, perhaps not a necessary, fault of the method may be found in the fact that the authors generally fail to manifest as much skill and care in sifting the historical facts, and in tracing the development of the institutions of each individual nation, as in showing the mutual reaction between the race and its environment. The word feudalism, for example, seems to be so loosely used throughout the volume as to render its accounts practically valueless for the critical student. All of these defects, however, cannot outweigh the peculiar advantages of this method, which one will be likely to miss hereafter in the universal histories of the old type. Each geographical section presented in this volume is introduced by a characterization of its relative position on the globe, and attempts are constantly made to interpret the life of the nations in the light of their surroundings and to deduce from this study certain laws of human progress. Great stress is laid upon the effects of the contact of different races and civilizations, including the results of the rule of the whites over the natives.

These observations, however, would not entirely apply to Max von Brandt's section on Japan, China, and Korea, which alone in the volume lacks sociological interest. Formerly a successful German envoy at Tokio and Peking, where his forceful personality is still remembered, the writer is satisfactory neither as a sociologist nor as a historian, neither in interpretation nor in criticism. However, his authorities on China are better than those on Japan, and his chapters on the history of Christianity in both countries are excellent.

The characteristic portion of the volume does not begin until von Brandt gives his place to the late Dr. Heinrich Schurtz, of Leipzig. The noted ethnologist has contributed a highly suggestive section on Central

Asia (in the German edition, *Hochasien*) and Siberia. On a fine geographical background he constructs his theories of the development of an agricultural civilization by the brachycephalic race which settled in China and Sumeria, and the subsequent expansion of the dolichocephalic Aryan nomads toward Central Asia, with the consequent movements and admixture of races of various stages of culture upon the plateau. Particularly illuminating is his account of the political relations of China with the Central Asiatic nomads, and of the continual religious and commercial communications which passed through the Tarim basin. The same writer's chapters on Indonesia, telling of the extensive migrations of the Negritos and Malays, are not less instructive.

The late Dr. Emil Schmidt's section on India, Ceylon, and Indo-China, which was written probably some years ago and has been revised by Dr. Helmolt, may be said to be of ordinary value. On the other hand, the chapters by Dr. Karl Weule on Australia and Oceania are closely parallel to Dr. Schurtz's in the richness of their sociological data. He also considers the missionary question, not as a mere series of historical incidents, but as a phase of the many-sided contact of the different races and cultures. Regarding the Indian Ocean — Dr. Weule seems to be deeply interested in the oceans — his views of the Chinese and Arab traders of the middle ages, and of the struggle of the English in modern times to control the ocean, are full of interest. Perhaps the chapters in this and other volumes, all of which have thus far been written by Dr. Weule, on the historical importance of the oceans are a characteristic mark of this work. Where else in a world's history is one apt to find such phrases as the geographical and historical axes of an ocean and a zone of its greatest historical density?

The English edition is not entirely free from mistranslations and misprints. To take only a few examples: *gongen* (incarnation) has been taken for a plural noun and translated as "gongs" (p. 11); *Reichsfürsten* and *Reichsunmittelbaren* are wrongly connected with the emperor, instead of with the feudal suzerain (pp. 33, 35, 36); and the last paragraph of section B on page 342, which is obscure enough in the German edition, is rendered in such a way that the translator himself could hardly have understood the meaning. The Chinese *mau* is made equivalent to 675.68 acres, instead of as many ares — a difference of forty to one (p. 63). The Area of Mongolia is stated to be 354,000 square kilometers, which should be 3,543,000 (p. 57). The German edition itself being careless of the transliteration of the Japanese *z* and *s*, and *j* and *y*, it is not strange that the translator has been often led astray. A useful sketch-map on p. 300 of the German is not reproduced in the English edition, although all the other excellent maps and plates have been admirably copied. Finally, following the general plan of the work, the volume lacks bibliographical data except the scanty references to a few authors scattered throughout the text.

K. ASAKAWA.

*Buddhist India.* By T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, LL.D., Ph.D. [The Story of the Nations.] (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1903. Pp. xv, 332.)

THE purpose of the book is the presentation in popular form of the life and history of India during the period of Buddhistic ascendancy. This presentation is professedly from the point of view of the Rajput, and not of the Brahman; accordingly it is based (the records of the Jains being accessible only in fragments) almost exclusively upon the Buddhistic literature. The Vedic *Samhitās*, *Brāhmanas*, and certain *Upanisads* are cited as testimony for pre-Buddhistic conditions; but, in accordance with a theory to be mentioned later, the testimony of the rest of the Vedic and of the classic literature is not considered admissible as contemporary evidence for the greater part of the period in question. Now the intimacy and accuracy of Professor Rhys Davids's knowledge of Buddhistic literature are universally recognized, and the unfailing interest with which one follows his exposition is the best testimony to the tact and skill with which he has applied this knowledge to the task of presenting to his readers a picture of this phase of Indian life. As a further merit of the presentation should be emphasized the fact that the liberal supply of references to the texts themselves make the work of value to the student, without detracting in the least from the general reader's enjoyment of its style and contents.

The book begins with a description of the systems of government in India at the time of the rise of Buddhism, the monarchies, the clans under a republican form of government, and the nations. The next three chapters are devoted to the social organization, the first and third being descriptions of life in the village and town respectively, while the second, on "Social Grades", argues against the existence at this period of a system of sharply-defined castes. Next, under the heading "Economic Conditions", is given a list of the various trades and avocations, an account of the system of traffic and coinage (with an appendix on the most ancient coins of India), an estimate of the wealth of the country, and a description of its trade-routes.

To the history of the introduction and development of writing two chapters are devoted. In the main, the author is in agreement with the results reached by Bühler, but ignores his perfectly sound argument (*Indische Palaeographie*, 18) that the oldest known form of the *Brāhmī* was an alphabet elaborated for the Sanskrit language by scholarly Brahmins. The following chapters deal with the development of the languages and literatures of India in general, and of the *Pāli* literature and of the *Jātaka* book in particular.

Very interesting is the section on religion, the first chapter of which describes, under the caption "Animism", the popular religious beliefs of pre-Buddhistic times, and contains a valuable collection of the allusions in the Buddhist literature to these beliefs. The practices condemned are evidently Atharvanic in character; many of them in fact are treated in

the *Atharva-Pariçistas*, while others crop out only in the later works on astrology. The next chapter is a brilliant though too unsympathetic account of the development of Brahmanism down to the time of Buddha. It is, I think, to be regretted that the author did not see fit to include at this point a sketch of Buddhism. The last section of the book is devoted to history in a narrower sense, and deals in three chapters with the great monarchs Chandragupta, Açoka, and Kaniska.

The theory already alluded to, which tinges a great part of the book, is one which has appeared in various forms since Senart's article in the *Journal Asiatique* in 1886. Space does not admit of its full statement, still less of its discussion. Its basis is that the order of the appearance of the Middle Indian dialects and the classic Sanskrit in the inscriptions is the order of their origin. So the author (p. 139) considers it "clear why Pali books written in India, or books in a dialect allied to Pali, or in a mixture of such a dialect and forms taken from pure Sanskrit, are each of them older than the books written in classical Sanskrit"; and (p. 315) that it is not at all impossible that Açvaghosa's *Buddha Carita* may be "the very earliest literary work written in regular Sanskrit for the use of the laity". Whether the phrase, "for the use of the laity", is meant to concede the earlier origin of the *Sûtra* literature it is impossible to determine; it would seem not, since in the table (pp. 153 ff.) no place is left for the *Sûtras* unless they are to be classed (inexactly) with classic Sanskrit, and on page 32 the author favors "the wholesale recasting of brahman literature in the Gupta period". It is of course but a corollary to this view that one may (p. 158) "happen, in reliance on the priestly books, to antedate, by about a thousand years, the victory of the priests".

Similar conclusions with regard to the date of the classic literature have recently been indicated by Franke as one of the possibilities following from the inscriptional data collected in his *Pali und Sanskrit* (Strassburg, 1902). In spite of the independent concurrence of two so eminent Pali scholars, it is, however, safe to predict that the views will not gain acceptance. The reasons are briefly: that there is sufficient direct evidence to the contrary; it forces the theory of too artificial an origin for Sanskrit, which was undoubtedly based on a spoken dialect; it is contradicted by the continuity of development of the language; and the facts of the inscriptions admit of another and simpler explanation.

Fortunately the value of the book does not depend upon one's acceptance of this theory. The author's plea for the necessity of a "just and proportionate use" of Buddhistic literature in dealing with the history and institutions of India will meet with no opposition, and even those who, like myself, believe that the author has gone too far towards the other extreme must be grateful to Professor Rhys Davids for this picture of India as the Buddhists saw it.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

*Evolution of the Japanese, Social and Psychic.* By SIDNEY L. GULICK, M.A. (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1903. Pp. vi, 457.)

THOSE who, weary of the shallowness of tourists and impressionist writers on Japan, wish an intelligent opinion concerning her people will welcome this serious effort to appraise the Japanese character. For such a study as that attempted by Dr. Gulick, and indeed before any generalizing of philosophy, there should be, besides a critical knowledge of history, a thorough mastery of all known facts properly correlated. Something very like these qualifications Dr. Gulick possesses. Besides fair scholarship in his special theme, he has studied humanity in other islands of the Pacific, and he has lived long among the Japanese, knowing well their story, their mind and thought, as well as the daily play of their emotions — the latter no mean qualification for reading the real character of these secretive people. He knows well that the national records and traditions as popularly believed and as copied by alien writers are largely worthless, because, as he says (p. 41), the "early Japanese scholars idealized their ancient history, and assigned to the Emperor a place in ancient times which in all probability he has seldom held". Dr. Gulick runs counter to the impressionist and subjective writers who in describing Japan have held the logical faculty in abeyance and have let fancy reign supreme; for, as the scholarly editor of *The Japan Mail* has well said, "The Japanese nation of Arnold and Hearn is not the nation we have known for a quarter of a century, but a purely ideal one manufactured out of the author's brain. It is high time that this was pointed out." Dr. Gulick has pointed it out. He has killed the Cinderella theory of the rise of modern Japan, leaving to some other scholar to show in detail how the Dutchmen at Desima, for nearly two hundred years, were busy in purveying Occidental ideas, principles, and methods to Japan, and how since 1859 a mighty army of experts, teachers, and advisers from many countries "have taken off their coats" in teaching the Japanese how to do things. In a word, the men of New Japan, having been unable at first to cast out the foreigners by brute force, adopted their ideas and methods, making resort to intellectual force and with real success. The practice since then (1868) has not been so much to detain the foreigner as to learn of him and then to eliminate him, for the Japanese adopts only that he may adapt. He rejects about as much as he selects. He learns from many, only to choose in order to keep what he himself needs. Above everything else, it is to be "Japan for the Japanese". Secretly the islander spurns even so much as comparison of Japan with the western nations, for, to the modern as to the ancient Japanese, Nippon was created first and stands on the top of the globe, other countries being created from what was left over. Against such conceit Dr. Gulick, while generous and optimistic, spares no sarcasm, and his Japanese readers will have soreness and sorrow in perusal of his book.



The Japanese believe and Dr. Gulick believes with them that the modern adaptation of Japan to her new environment is in no sense of the word a transformation, a miracle, or a fairy-tale, but is according to true evolution. At a certain period, when in clash with Occidental civilization as represented by southern Europe — governed by a king of kings who had a very businesslike vicar on earth — the chief ruler of Japan, to save the nation's independence, chose hermitage and isolation. This was governmentally a normal procedure, but not a popular desire. The Japanese from the dawning of history in the fifth century have always been eager for knowledge and have a genius for selection and appropriation. Following this theory in over thirty chapters and discussing in masterly style every phase of native character, Dr. Gulick shows that there is no sound reason for adhering to the convenient fiction of a "race soul", and that the Japanese, in the general stream of forces which once kept them in segregation but has now brought them into the world's congregation, have every probability of becoming socially and psychically, as they are now certainly with rapidity becoming as to physique, typical modern men. Whether Dr. Gulick holds the final philosophy as to evolution, or holds in every case consistently to its application, is not for the present critic to say, but as a profound study of the Japanese people this work is worthy of the highest praise.

WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS.

*The Ancient Capital of Scotland: the Story of Perth from the Invasion of Agricola to the Passing of the Reform Bill.* By SAMUEL COWAN, J. P. (New York: James Pott and Company. 1904. Two volumes, pp. xv, 408; vii, 392.)

Mr. COWAN informs his readers that he has been for forty years identified with the social and political life of Perth and has long given his attention to the history of that ancient town. He confesses that he has with difficulty restricted himself to two volumes — they are bulky ones! — and submits to the judgment of the public the success of his undertaking. It is the business of the reviewer, meanwhile, to point out to the public what it may expect to find in these volumes and, further, to indicate whether or not the work has been well done and may be regarded as furnishing trustworthy information.

In the first volume Mr. Cowan treats in separate chapters of the foundation of Perth and the beginnings of Scottish Christianity and national life. Then follow two chapters devoted to the archaeology and topography of the town, in which the author attempts to reconstruct its vanished monuments and former appearance. These are succeeded by six chapters dealing with the history of important local families and miscellaneous national events more or less connected with Perth. Two final chapters are devoted to an examination of the records of the town council in so far as they illustrate the daily life and relations of the community. In the second volume the Ruthven Raid, the affairs of the



local kirk, the Gowrie Conspiracy, and the general subject of witchcraft in Scotland are treated in five successive chapters. Then, and in the order named, we have chapters on Cromwell in Scotland, the Reformation at Perth, the Jacobite movements of 1715 and 1745, and the life of the community in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Irrespective of the fashion in which these subjects are treated, it will be seen from this survey of its contents that Mr. Cowan's work is not strictly the history of a municipality—it offers us historical memoirs of Perth rather than the history of the city itself. There is no continuity, no illustration of the growth and decay of institutions. The author's own words show his misunderstanding of the function of the local historian. "The history of the Ancient Capital", he says in his preface, "is in some respects a history of Scotland, as many of the events which appear on the record were all more or less national as well as local". Still, if the work had been well done, even on these lines it might have been of value. This, however, is not the case, and it is difficult to see, indeed, how the work could have been much worse done. The two volumes before us afford little more than a disorderly mass of trivial gossip and extracts from national history drawn from second-hand authorities.

This is a grave judgment to pass on a book which is manifestly the fruit of real enthusiasm and large if misdirected industry, but it can be only too well sustained. Consider first Mr. Cowan's method. He has a completely unscientific and irresponsible fashion of dealing with his material. Here are a few examples. In treating the origin of the Mercer family he writes:

The earliest mention is in the Register of the Privy Council, which says: "John Mercer is said to have gifted to Malcolm Canmore his three water mills at Perth (afterwards assigned to the town by Robert III.), in return for which the Mercers obtained right to a burial vault in St. John's Church". This seems a most important entry, and evidently quite authentic. Malcolm Canmore reigned from 1046 to 1102. (I, 264.)

Again, he is arguing against Hill Burton for the authenticity of Boece's story of the battle of Luncarty and the origin of the Hay family:

We must consider what evidence there is against the theory of the learned writer. The battlefield is to this day pointed out, and accumulations of human bones have been discovered there. If there were no battle where did these bones come from? And if the armorial bearings of the Earl of Errol are founded on a traditional battle, that would have been determined long ago by scientific inquiry. It therefore seems impossible to support the theory laid down by Dr. Hill Burton on arguments which do not touch on what is contained in that standard authority, the Douglas Peerage. (I, 201.)

Such is Mr. Cowan's notion of historical evidence and its uses. In a chapter devoted to the Gowrie conspiracy he tries to prove the guilt of the king, a thesis which he previously attempted to sustain in a not very fortunate book.<sup>1</sup> At the outset he remarks, "The Gowrie Conspiracy

<sup>1</sup> See AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, VIII, 755-757.

was different from every other conspiracy, in respect that it was evidently a plot by a royal personage against a subject" (II, 66). It would not be easy to find a better example of the *petitio principii*. In detailing the events that took place at Gowrie House, he cites Hill Burton, *History of Scotland*, with the comment, "this authority we consider quite conclusive" (II, 73 n.). Again, on p. 77 he says, "He [the king] was Gowrie's debtor for the sum of £80,000", but twenty pages below he admits, "we have not been able to verify the £80,000". In dealing with the battle of Tibbermore he observes, "It is said on good authority that Lord Drummond's treachery was the cause of Elcho's defeat", and cites in a foot-note Chambers's *Dictionary of Eminent Scotsmen* (II, 140). Rarely does one encounter a writer more *allictus jurare verba magistri*, and although at the outset one was rather aghast to find Mr. Cowan accepting with tranquil faith the Roman origin of the municipality Perth, one sees on reaching the second volume that nothing else could have been expected.

Mr. Cowan has printed a number of documents, but as only one of those that are written in Latin is given in the original, their usefulness is much impaired, the more so as many of them are admittedly condensed and the wording of the translation does not inspire confidence. The historical value — they could not pretend to any other — of the illustrations of the town and its monuments may be gaged by this naïve remark:

The picture (enlarged) forms the frontispiece of this volume, and we have employed an artist to redraw and engrave the monastic buildings. These beautiful illustrations will arouse much interest, as we are not aware that they have ever before been put before the public. We do not guarantee absolute accuracy; our sole aim is to convey some idea of the general appearance of the edifices, their situation outside the walls, and styles of architecture. (I, 112.)

If we turn from the illustrations to the bibliography we meet with the same state of things. There is a list of thirty-five titles in which the *Exchequer Rolls*, Henry Adamson's *The Muses Threnodie*, and Skene's *Celtic Scotland* are on an equal footing, nor is there one of the indispensable bibliographical indications, such as date and place of publication, the edition made use of, and the like. One misses also the more recent works on Scottish history, such as the contributions of Professor Hume Brown, Mr. Lang, and Mr. Rait.

Mr. Cowan's style is eminently Scottish — at moments indeed it is not even English, as witness the following sentences: "The Romans founded various towns in Scotland at that period, although we have no historic record" (I, 18); "The descent of the water into the 'boot' through the ring forms a strong cascade, where, in former days, people having rheumatism and colds, by bathing here, were said to be cured" (I, 66). Other examples of this sort of thing, as well as the use of such barbarisms as "wrongous" occur in volume I, 19, 87; volume II, 33, 134, 149, 195, 245. There are misprints in volume I, 115, 246, 370; volume II, 64.

With all this censure, one must not omit to call attention to what there is of good in the book. The translated medieval documents have a certain indirect value. The spirited letters of Mrs. Smythe of Methven (I, ch. x), give a lively illustration of the disturbances occasioned by the Covenanters, and a striking picture of a courageous woman. The letters of the Earl of Mar in connection with the rising in 1715 (II, ch. XXI) are also of value. Some of the illustrations, too, are good, notably the reproductions of portraits and of coins and seals. Finally there is a full index, standing, perversely enough, at the end of the first volume.

GAILLARD THOMAS LAPSLEY.

*Modern History: Europe from Charlemagne to the Present Time.*

By WILLIS MASON WEST. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon. 1904. Pp. xii, 651.)

THIS text-book, written primarily for high-schools, is so constructed that it may be used in several kinds of courses. Though entitled a "Modern History", it really takes up the story of Europe in 800 A. D., where it was left by the author's well-known *Ancient History*; it is thus admirably fitted for use in the second year in those schools which are able to adopt the full four-year course recommended by the Committee of Seven. But inasmuch as many schools find it impossible to devote a whole year to Europe and another to England, Mr. West has woven in, here and there, the essentials of English history. And finally one feature in which it differs most markedly from the books of Robinson, Myers, Munro and Whitcomb, and Adams is the exceptionally full treatment given to the most recent history — as much space to the last hundred years as to the preceding thousand. This makes the book more satisfactory for schools which believe that "the high school course in history ought to put the student in touch with present movements in politics and society" (p. iv). It makes possible, for instance, an excellent account, well illustrated with maps, of the expansion of Europe into Asia and Africa. But perhaps all will not agree with Mr. West that "we can well afford to treat with brevity the more ephemeral phases of the Middle Ages, however quaint, if thereby can adequate space be won for the marvelous nineteenth century". Is there not danger of destroying the sense of proportion and of crowding unduly some of the great movements of the past? The German Reformation, for instance, is dismissed with a scant five pages, and there is no mention of Zwingli. Be it said, however, that the work of condensation, always difficult, has been done with unusual success by Mr. West. On every page one is surprised at the amount of information crowded in, while the relative importance of subjects is sharply indicated by the elaborate variations in type and the detailed analysis with numbers and letters. There are nearly forty maps, including not merely the obvious and ordinary ones, but many which visualize at a glance complicated or unsuspected relations; such, for instance, are the sketch-maps showing the Norse kingdom of Canute the

Great (p. 20), German expansion and colonization eastward, 800-1400 (p. 71), and the races of Austria-Hungary (p. 500). At the head of each chapter are two or three "theme sentences", or suggestive quotations, the truth of which the pupil will realize as he reads and ponders the chapter. Another good feature is the report topics suggested for collateral reading or essays; they are usually upon interesting subjects which text-books often incorporate, but which Mr. West has excluded in order to have more room for solid facts. There are also helpful suggestions to teachers for drill-work and reviews, and a good bibliography, though the names of some of the authors are misspelled.

With a good teacher, and an earnest, rather advanced pupil this is one of the best text-books that can be used. There is more in it and more can be gotten from it than is the case with the other books which cover the same field. But that it will interest the average pupil we are not certain; there is perhaps too much cut and dried classification, too much emphasis on political rather than social history, and too little to touch the imagination or to stimulate the pupil's independent thinking and reasoning concerning cause and effect. A hero is characterized by a few adjectives rather than by even a brief account of one of his deeds. To make the book completely successful, much illustrative and explanatory matter must be supplied by the teacher, for there are many pithy statements, which, standing alone as they do, are only half-truths, and liable to mislead a pupil. The minor errors, perhaps inevitable in the first edition of a text-book covering so wide a field, are easily corrected.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

*Études sur le Règne de Hugues Capet et la Fin du X<sup>e</sup> Siècle.* Par FERDINAND LOT. [Fascicule 147 de la Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études.] (Paris: Émile Bouillon. 1903. Pp. xl, 525.)

*Fidèles ou Vassaux.* Par FERDINAND LOT. (Paris: Émile Bouillon. 1904. Pp. xxxiv, 287.)

THE series of studies on the transition period in French history from the Carolingian to the Capetian house, planned by the late M. Arthur Giry and undertaken by his pupils in the École des Hautes Études, has received its latest and perhaps its last addition in the first of the above-named volumes. M. Lot is well known as the author of the earliest of the series, *Les Derniers Carolingiens* (1891), and also as the successor of M. Giry in his work of instruction in the École des Hautes Études. The present volume does not pretend to be a systematic history of the reign, or a biography of Hugh Capet, but it is, as its title declares, a series of studies on the period. There is a sketch of the events of the reign divided into two parts at the year 991, and there are especially detailed studies of the two important relations of the new royal power: to the papacy and the church, and to the great feudal barons.

Under the first of these, of particular interest is a sketch of the growth of an actual papal administrative and judicial power over the Gallican church. M. Lot shows how little of this there really was before the middle of the ninth century, and how rapidly it was developed after that date, beginning with the papacy of Nicholas I. This includes a study of the coming into use of the False Decretals and of the attitude toward them of Gerbert, who argued against some of their conclusions but did not question their authenticity. M. Lot shows once more the value to the crown in this period of the support of the church, and brings out more clearly than has been done before the much larger number of bishoprics and abbeys directly dependent on the king than on any of the great barons. In this particular the relative strength of the crown was far greater than in territory or in military resources. Incidentally the volume treats in some detail of the history of Gerbert, of whose letters—one of the chief sources of our knowledge of the age—M. Lot is preparing a new edition.

Under the head of relation to the great baronies, the author studies at some length each of these latter in this particular with many interesting details, but reaches no other conclusion than the great practical weakness of the crown. In both books he strongly asserts his belief that the "Duchy of France" was not a definite territory, but a regency of the kingdom. The elements of a reconstruction of the royal power are found in the ideas of the monarchy kept alive in the feudal relationship, in those held and taught by the church, and in the ideas of nationality and unity expressed in some of the oral literature of the time and so brought into popular consciousness. One-half the volume is devoted to appendixes on special points of chronology, of political history, on the surname Capet, etc. Of particular interest is one on the home, date, and author of the False Decretals, in which M. Lot decides in favor of Reims, shortly after 853, and on Vulfadus as the probable author, conclusions also reached by Lurz in his *Heimat Pseudo-Isidors*, published in 1898, but not before M. Lot's conclusions had been reached. Another very useful appendix gives a table of all the abbeys presumably in existence at the end of the tenth century, with place, name of the patron, and references to the sources.

In the second volume here reviewed M. Lot discusses an important point of institutional history of the same general period: were the great barons bound to the crown by a tie of vassalage, or by a looser and lighter bond of fealty only, which would give their practically independent sovereignties something more nearly a legal foundation? Luchaire and Glasson have inclined to the latter view, and it has been strongly advocated by Flach in the third volume of his *Origines*, reviewed in the July number of this REVIEW. Against this theory M. Lot argues vigorously, and in my opinion with entire success. He takes up one after another the baronies of the six lay peers of the thirteenth century, and studies in full detail their relations to the crown in this particular during the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries. From a point soon after the begin-

ning of the twelfth century there ceases to be any question of the nature of the relationship, and the argument for that age is clearly demonstrative. For the two earlier centuries the evidence is rather of a probable character, and what M. Lot calls the *a priori* argument is of more importance than he seems inclined to admit. Some parts of this could have been developed more at length with advantage, as for example the consideration that there is no point between the beginning of the tenth century and the middle of the thirteenth when it would have been possible for a weak Capetian king to have transformed the supposed loose tie of mere fealty into liege homage, and that any attempt to do it would have left indelible traces in the records of the age. Much depends on the argument to show that during this age fealty and vassalage were practically identical, or, as M. Lot expresses it, that fealty was not conceived of as a weaker bond than vassalage. This also could with profit have been given in greater detail. The argument is, however, convincing and conclusive as it stands. Although the book was written before the appearance of M. Flach's third volume, it is a valuable corrective of the peculiar teachings of that work.

GEORGE B. ADAMS.

*Chronicon Ada de Usk, A. D. 1377-1421.* Edited with a translation and notes by SIR EDWARD MAUNDE THOMPSON, K.C.B. Second edition. (London: Royal Society of Literature; New York: Henry Frowde. 1904. Pp. xxxviii, 346.)

THE present work is an amplification of a previous edition (1876) by the same editor, which closed with 1404. The discovery of the missing part, in a manuscript of the Duke of Rutland's collection at Belvoir Castle, is one of the many services of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, and its identification is due to Sir Henry Maxwell-Lyte. The new edition entirely replaces the old. It has more complete notes and a better and more extensive preface, and is, on the whole, a scholarly production.

Adam of Usk's *Chronicle* is important as a personal record of events in which the author, who was a prominent figure in his day, participated, rather than as a historical record of the times. Born at Usk in Monmouthshire about 1352, he attained a high record at Oxford. He took the degree of doctor of laws, was *extraordinarius* in canon law, and held a chair in civil law until 1392. From then until 1399 he practised in the episcopal courts of Canterbury, under patronage of Archbishop Arundel, as whose follower he joined Henry of Lancaster at Bristol in his successful attempt on the throne. Adam's mediation saved his native town from pillage, and his friend, the Lord of Powis, from the wrath of Henry. He was one of the commission of bishops, lords, and doctors appointed to draw up the charges upon which Richard II was deposed. Consequently, his chronicle abounds in interesting events of these years, beginning with the Parliament of 1397, at which he was present. His



confirmation of two of the most charming anecdotes of Richard's deposition renders them worthy of credence. He was one of the few present at the lonely meal in which the king wept over his fickle and contentious realm, and he gives us a version of the story of Richard's greyhound more remarkable than the one generally known from Froissart.

Mention should here be made of an event in Adam's career of great psychological interest and characteristically medieval. It had not been hitherto known why, in February, 1402, he departed suddenly for Rome; but from a patent-roll of 4 Henry IV, Mr. Wylie has given us the real reason. On November 2, 1400, the erudite doctor of laws, accompanied by two retainers, one of them a near relative, took to the road near Westminster, and robbed a certain Walter Jakes of a black horse, with saddle and bridle, valued at one hundred shillings, and also of fourteen marks in cash; this notwithstanding the fact that he was the holder of important benefices, perhaps in line for a bishopric, and stood in high favor with the king, who submitted important legal questions to him (pp. 48-54). His chronicle reveals the soul of a genuinely pious although superstitious man, whose actions seem generous and disinterested.

At Rome he was favorably received and was speedily appointed to the important post of chaplain and auditor to Boniface IX, maintaining the same position after the accession of his friend Innocent VII. Important English and Welsh benefices were conferred upon him, and he was even intended for the bishoprics of Hereford and St. David's, the appointment being in each case prevented by the allegations of his enemies and by Henry IV's opposition. His description of papal customs and contemporary events at Rome forms an important part of the *Chronicle*. But disgusted with his misfortunes consequent upon the expulsion of Innocent VII from Rome in 1405, Adam resolved to return to England. For two years he waited in vain for the king's pardon, whilst engaged in legal practice in northern France and in Flanders. About the end of 1408 he crossed over to Wales and swore allegiance to Owen Glendower, through whom he reached his friend Lord Powis. He was finally pardoned in 1411, and died, in prosperous circumstances, in 1430. To his association with Glendower and also to Adam's own nationality we owe his valuable description of the protracted struggle of the Welsh for independence.

GEORGE KRIEHN.

*L'Organisation du Travail à Bruxelles au XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle.* Par G. DES MAREZ. [Extrait du Tome LXV des *Mémoires Couronnés et autres Mémoires* publiés par l'Académie Royale de Belgique.] (Brussels: Henri Lamertin. 1904. Pp. xii, 520.)

DES MAREZ, a pupil of Pirenne, has been for some years favorably known for his work in Belgian economic history. His *Étude sur la Propriété Foncière dans les Villes du Moyen-Âge*, which in 1898 first brought him into notice, though in title and manner rather too pretentious, contained valuable material for the history of property and institutions in



some of the Flemish towns. A number of lesser monographs, among which *La Lettre de Foire à Ypres au XIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Brussels, 1901) is the most notable, have since attested his activity in this field. The book now under review, written in response to a problem set by the Royal Academy of Belgium, announces itself as a part of the larger enterprise to which the author has devoted himself, the history of commerce and industry in Belgium from the beginnings of town civilization to the end of the *ancien régime*. It is a fortunate balance to this ambitious program that its projector so fully realizes the necessity for careful preliminary exploration of the abundant unpublished material. A diligent use of the Brussels archives has furnished a solid basis for the present volume, and this "vaste et minutieuse enquête", as Des Marez himself describes it, has yielded in his hands no mere compilation of excerpts from the town and gild records, but a competent study of gild organization and activity in Brussels during a most interesting period. It is a sound and useful book, adding new details and illustrating afresh familiar aspects of handicraft regulation and gild history. The author asks, indeed, few new questions of his sources, he propounds no novel theories, no striking solution of old difficulties, but is content for the most part, well-read as he is, to accept questions, theories, and criticisms of theories from recent German work on medieval town history. But of brilliant hypotheses we have perhaps had enough of late; it is sufficient praise for the builder to say of this stone in his promised edifice that it is well-quarried and fair-hewn; no one can find fault with a building-stone for being somewhat heavy.

The craft-gilds of the towns of Brabant, checked in their growth by the tardy economic development of this region and hampered, at least in Brussels and Antwerp, by the combined opposition of the old patrician drapers' gild and the aristocratic magistracy, were almost a century behind the Flemish towns in gaining official recognition and formal incorporation — and this only after repeated revolts. With the exception of the goldsmiths, the crafts did not begin to constitute themselves under official sanction until 1365, and it was not until 1421 that, seizing a propitious political conjuncture, they finally established themselves in power, not, however, as in Flanders, entirely displacing the patrician element, but sharing with it the town government under a constitution, jealously guarded by checks and balances, which endured to the French Revolution. This triumph of 1421 seems to have marked the acme of gild-life, soon followed by the signs of gradual decline. The political order, thus firmly founded on a craft-gild basis, tended to perpetuate the handicraft organization long after its vitality had been sapped and its unaided strength had become unequal to the contest with new economic and social forces. But similarity of economic ideas and conditions, the common instinct of self-preservation, produced under varying political situations very similar results. Here, as elsewhere, in an environment constantly less favorable as the town economy gave way before the national economy, in face of a relatively declining local industry and trade and

of an increasing financial burden, the crafts, bent on the maintenance of their existence and ideals, were forced to harden their protective armor. And so there was organized that whole structure of gild and town regulation which sought by the exclusion or limitation of competition to secure equal and permanent subsistence conditions for the handicraftsmen of the gilds. Practically all the articulations of this carapace may be studied in Brussels craft-gild history. The growing exclusiveness in apprenticeship and mastership regulations, until in one instance, that of the butchers, the craft became ultimately a hereditary caste, the *Zunftzwang*, which here stood at the middle rather than at the initial stage of gild development, the minute control of production and sale, of wages and prices, all this apparatus of protection and restriction is described in sober detail by Des Marez — from the civic solemnities which attended the preparation of the standard loaf of bread, the *pain-type*, to the petty and acrimonious disputes on the delimitation of work as between rival crafts. Many of these minutiae merely elaborate well-known features of gild development, but there emerge some points worthy of note, such, for instance, as the discussion of the patrician drapers' gild-jurisdiction as compared with that of the craft-gilds and the relation of both to the *échevinage*. The sections dealing with the military obligations of the craftsmen and with the charitable brotherhoods associated with the gilds, which undertook to provide relief in case of accident, sickness, and old age, possess a value enhanced by the fact that these sides of town life have ordinarily been too much neglected. On some other topics of general interest Des Marez's material throws little light. He follows the fashion in criticizing Bücher's "wage-work" and "price-work" as historical categories and he attempts a not altogether convincing correction of von Below's thesis of the non-existence of an exclusively wholesale merchant class in medieval society. The term "great merchant", as Des Marez remarks, must be relative to the stage of commercial progress, and in the sense in which it is used by Bücher may be admissible, but inconclusive instances from so late a date as the end of the fifteenth century are hardly sufficient to invalidate von Below's special contention.

EDWIN F. GAY.

*A Critical Study of the Various Dates assigned to the Birth of Christopher Columbus. The Real Date 1451. With a Bibliography of the Question.* By HENRY VIGNAUD. (London: Henry Stevens, Son, and Stiles. 1903. Pp. xii, 121.)

HARDLY any subject relating to Columbus has proved more baffling to investigators than the determination of the date of his birth. That a man who wrote so much as did Columbus should not once have given his own age among the many autobiographical passages in his writings is strange; that the statements he did make which bear on his age cannot possibly be harmonized seems at first even more perplexing. These little oversights on the part of the admiral have been so prolific in labors for

inquiring posterity that one is tempted to suspect that he had it in mind to mystify impertinent curiosity.

Of late years there has been an increasing tendency to accept 1446-1447 as the real date. The basis on which this conclusion rests are: the fact that on March 20, 1472, Columbus witnessed a will, to do which it is assumed that he must have reached the full majority of twenty-five years of age; and the fact that on May 25, 1471, he bound himself by a contract with the consent of his parents, which implies that he had not then reached his majority. These conclusions Mr. Vignaud contests by showing that it was not necessary for a witness to have reached his full majority and that sometimes the parent's consent to a son's contract was necessary even after the son was twenty-five.

Mr. Vignaud then discusses the laws of Genoa relating to the subordinate or qualified majorities at sixteen, seventeen, and eighteen years, besides the full majority of twenty-five. The next step in the argument is supplied by a document discovered by Staglieno in 1887. It reads: "Christofforus de Colombo filius Dominici, major annis decemnovem et in presentia, auctoritate, concilio et consensu dicti Dominici ejus patris", etc. ("Christopher Columbus upwards of nineteen years of age", etc.). This has usually been interpreted to mean over nineteen and under twenty-five, but Mr. Richard Davey, a well-known English journalist, suggested in 1892 that it meant just what it said, "over nineteen years of age", and that it was equivalent in ordinary usage to saying "nineteen years old", or that he had passed his nineteenth birthday. Professor Gonzalez de la Rosa supported this view in 1900, and it is now taken up by Mr. Vignaud, who makes the strong point that as no law of Genoa has been found prescribing the attainment of nineteen years as a legal qualification for any acts, and as the various legal ages were sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, and twenty-five, there is no occasion for or meaning in recording that a party to a contract was over nineteen unless it was to state his age. Otherwise it would be said that he had passed the majority of eighteen, or that he was less than twenty-five years, "Minor viginti quinque annis". As nineteen was not one of these specified ages conferring a partial majority, "major annis decemnovem" means simply nineteen years old. Had Columbus been twenty or twenty-one it would have read "major viginti annis", etc. On p. 89 Mr. Vignaud quotes from Desimoni a similar expression, *e. g.*, "major annorum XXII", when the interpretation seems to be the same, that at the last birthday the age was twenty-two.

It seems to me that Mr. Vignaud has made out a strong case and that the evidence is at least quite as good for 1451 as for 1446 and much less intricate and uncertain. As is well known, Columbus's early life is still shrouded in a haze which it is difficult to penetrate further than to show that it was not what Las Casas and Ferdinand have given us. That as late as March 20, 1472, he was officially recorded as "lanerius de Jauna", "woolen worker of Genoa", argues, it seems to me, for as late a date of birth as is consistent with other data. Such a description,

while not excluding his having begun to follow the sea, would hardly be used if he were already an expert seaman. Again, that one who began a seafaring life much after twenty should have become so accomplished a navigator seems improbable. The main misgiving that one feels about Mr. Vignaud's argument is in supposing that an expert Italian lawyer like Desimoni is mistaken in his interpretation of Genoese usage in regard to such matters as the deductions to be made from the notarial documents, for although Mr. Vignaud cites one statement of Desimoni's in favor of his view, Desimoni's own conclusions are quite positively in favor of 1446-1447. One feels, too, that the interpretation of "major annis decemnovem" as asserting that Columbus had completed his nineteenth year, while natural and probable, is not certain. In the mass of notarial documents collected by Staglieno there are very few statements of the age of the parties, and when the age is stated the following form is used more than once: "etatis annorum. XI. in circa" (*Raccolta Colombiano*, Part II, vol. 1, 83).

Mr. Vignaud has supplied all the data for an independent judgment on the part of the student, reprinting extracts from the Genoese statutes as to legal ages, all the notarial documents bearing on the question which Columbus signed, all the arguments given for the series of supposable birth-dates from 1430 to 1458, a list of the authorities supporting these dates respectively arranged under years, and a general bibliography of the sources as well. Whatever may finally be the conclusion of critics on Mr. Vignaud's contention, he has placed students under great obligations by thus collecting the requisite data to enable one to see almost at a glance how the case stands with each of the rival dates, which outnumber the cities which competed for the honor of Homer's birth. Under 1451 Ruge is wrongly cited as favoring that date in his *Columbus*. He comes out positively for 1446-1447 on page 24 of that work. The publishers have clothed this monograph in a most attractive form.

EDWARD G. BOURNE.

*The Oldest Map with the Name America of the Year 1507 and the Carta Marina of the Year 1516 by M. Waldseemüller (Ilacomilus).*

Edited by JOSEPH FISCHER and FR. R. VON WIESER. (London: Henry Stevens, Son, and Stiles. 1903. Pp. 55, and 27 plates.)

DURING the last twenty-five years a large number of valuable maps, the work of early sixteenth-century cartographers, have been brought to light, notably the Cantino, the Canerio, the Hamy, and the Waldseemüller world-maps of 1507 and 1516. Among these, the two last-named, which are also the last discovered, hold a most important place. It perhaps would not be difficult to demonstrate that they hold first place in the influence exerted.

Such materials for studying early cartography are of course none too frequent, for, as Kohl well says, "With no class of historical documents has time been more destructive". Very nearly all of the charts drawn

by pilots, captains, and professional draftsmen who accompanied early expeditions to the New World and sketched its coasts *de visu* have disappeared, and the maps which have come down to us are compilations into which many of the sketches of more or less limited regions have entered. And yet in the increasing interest in cartographical studies, stimulated by these important finds of early and elaborately executed work, there perhaps may lie the assurance that at no distant day many of the lost originals may be recovered.

Whatever the fame enjoyed by Waldseemüller in his day as cartographer and student of geography, he seems chiefly to have been remembered in later years as one of Duke René's literary coterie, as the author of a little work which he called *Cosmographie Introductio*, and as co-editor of the 1513 Strasburg edition of Ptolemy, to which work he added some new maps. Since Humboldt's discovery of near seventy years ago, his fame has rested very largely, at least in the popular mind, upon the fact, then made known, that he was the first to propose the name America for a part of the newly-discovered regions in the west. That Waldseemüller had drawn and published a large world-map as early as 1507 appeared certain from the references in his little book and from allusions in letters written by himself and by his friends. From these references, however, only a very imperfect conception could be formed of the character of the map. With the finding of this long-lost map in the summer of 1901 he comes anew before the world as a cartographer of great distinction, indeed as a workman whose labors were epoch-making.

While searching the archives of Wolfegg Castle in Württemberg for cartographical material which might be of value to him in his studies of the Norse discoveries in the New World, Professor Joseph Fischer, S. J., of Stella Matutina College, Feldkirch, Austria, had the good fortune to discover an ancient folio bearing the book-plate of Johann Schöner, a cartographer and mathematician of distinction, a contemporary and acquaintance of Waldseemüller. This folio enclosed within its covers some fragments of the work of Schöner, a star-map drawn by Albrecht Dürer, and two large world-maps by Waldseemüller each consisting of twelve sheets printed from engraved blocks. It is very evident that these were intended as wall-maps, each measuring with its parts properly joined about eight feet by four. Very shortly after the discovery had been made, Professor Fischer took the steps necessary for their reproduction. To this end every courtesy was offered by Fürst Franz von Waldburg-Wolfegg, the possessor of the documents, and with the financial support of the Imperial Academy of Sciences in Vienna and the assistance of the distinguished professor of geography Fr. R. von Wieser this volume of excellent facsimiles made its appearance a few months since. The English translator, the Rev. George Pickel, S. J., of Canisius College, Buffalo, N. Y., is at times amusingly literal in his part of the work. While it is to be regretted that the editors have presented so brief a critical study of the maps (about fifty-five pages, double columns, German and English),

in full justice to the work there can be found little reason for adverse criticism but much to praise, particularly so when it is recalled that those interested have waited but a comparatively short time before having access to the maps.

Conjectures have been many as to the real character of the map which the *Cosmographia* was designed to accompany. Waldseemüller referred to it as a large map on which had been designated the different realms by means of escutcheons, particular reference being made to the imperial eagle of the Empire, the papal keys in various parts of Europe, the Mohammedan crescent in Africa and in parts of Asia, the cross of Prester John in India, the coat of arms representing the regions belonging to the kings of Spain and Portugal, and the small crosses to indicate the location of shoals. Now that we have the map before us, it can be considered as nothing less than a remarkable piece of work, whatever the point of view, when one takes into consideration the time and place of its preparation. It is not dated, neither does it bear the name of Waldseemüller, but it answers completely the author's brief description. Many of its legends accord with those given in the *Cosmographia*. It is clearly the original used by Glareanus in the preparation of his maps, discovered about ten years ago; indeed that cartographer states that he had reproduced the work of Waldseemüller. As could be expected, the name America is given to a part of the newly-discovered regions in the west, but is clearly not intended to be applied to the whole as is so often but erroneously stated or implied by writers who treat our early history. Lastly, in the map of 1516 there is an explicit reference to the work of 1507, in which it is stated that it had been printed in 1,000 copies. None have ventured to doubt that we now have the long-lost map, the map *in plano* to which he referred in his expression "*Universalis Cosmographiae descriptio tam in solido quam plano*". There is also here new evidence in this map that the Hauslav-Liechtenstein gore map is a copy of Waldseemüller's map *in solido*, although the doubt is not yet entirely removed as to whether Waldseemüller meant a globe by that Latin term.

The projection of the 1507 map is that of Ptolemy, but the modification is marked. The small inset maps at the top, an original idea with him, are the oldest known maps in which the earth's surface has been divided into two hemispheres. These are nothing less than the originals of the rough woodcuts by Stobnicza, to which considerable importance has hitherto been attached. His portraits of Ptolemy and Vespucci, drawn to the right and the left of the hemispheres the old and the new world respectively, are of course mere sketches of fancy. Waldseemüller exhibits what appears as an interesting inconsistency in his opinion respecting the contour of the New World. In his inset maps he indicates a Central-American isthmus, while in the large map he shows a strait between the land to the north and that to the south. The presentation in the large map may be but the expression of a belief in the insular character of the newly-discovered regions. That he was strongly influenced in his cartographical notions by Ptolemy for the regions professedly



known by that ancient geographer is very evident, notably for the regions in the far east, but new sources necessarily served him for the lands beyond the world of Ptolemy, and the evidence that his sources here were largely Portuguese is none the less certain. He shows clearly in this map that he believed the new discoveries in the west were no part of Asia, a belief more generally entertained at that early date than many of the recent historians of the period would have us believe.

There are many respects in which the marine map of 1516 is a more interesting piece of work than is the world-map of 1507. That it exerted a marked influence on the cartography of the century, though perhaps not so marked as the earlier one, is now certain. The brief mention by Ortelius in his catalogue of 1570 of a marine map by Waldseemüller, without date and published in Germany, contains about the only information we had of this before Professor Fischer's discovery. The style and excellence of the draftmanship which the *Carta Marina* exhibits suggest the thought that Albrecht Dürer, or a prominent member of his school, here rendered cartographical science a service. It is not drawn on the Ptolemaic projection, but on a rectangular network of degrees, and is distinctly marked as a marine chart by intersecting rhumb-lines issuing from compass-cards with thirty-two divisions. Twice the name of Waldseemüller appears on the chart, and among others there is the interesting but not altogether definite legend "Consumatum est in oppido S. Deodati compositione et digestionem Martini Waldseemuller Ilacomili". A dedication on one of the sheets to Hugo de Hassard, bishop of Toul, honors that patron of the Vosgian Gymnasium.

Although this has been referred to as a world-map, Waldseemüller has omitted more than one hundred degrees of longitude. The northern region of the New World is designated as *Terra de Cuba Asiae Partis*, but he leaves us wholly in doubt as to his belief respecting the manner in which *Terra de Cuba* is joined with the continent of Asia. The name *Prisilia sive Terra Papagalli* now takes the place of America, a change prompted by a sense of justice to Columbus, it would seem from the legend: "Hec [regio] per Hispanos et Portugalenses frequentatis navigationibus inventa circa annos Domini 1492: quorum capitanei fuere Cristoforus Columbus Januensis Primus, Petrus Aliares secundus, Albericus Vesputius tertius", a legend which also appears on the Schöner globe of 1520. The details of this map show a decided advance in knowledge since the issue of the map of 1507, and indicate that the author had been guided less by Ptolemy and more by the modern maps.

He often refers in his *Cosmographie* to the sources he consulted in the preparation of his map of 1507. Clearly Ptolemy held first place among these sources, yet Marco Polo also served him for the east, Donnus Nicolaus Germanus for the Scandinavian regions, Portuguese maps and reports for the African coasts and for the New World, particularly maps of the Behaim, the Martellus, the Hamy, and especially the Canerio types. In a personal letter from Professor Fischer he expresses the belief that he has found but recently some of Waldseemüller's map



sources, hitherto unknown, for certain sections of eastern Africa and Asia. All these sources with a number of others enter into his work.

As for the *Carta Marina*, the editors can hardly be accused of overstatement in referring to it as "a printed edition of the Canerio chart, not indeed a slavish reprint; but an improved and . . . enlarged edition". In nomenclature, in legends, in coast contours the resemblance is striking. A large number of his sources for this map are expressly enumerated in a legend which is conspicuously given. That the Portuguese cartography of the new discoveries should have exerted so remarkable an influence on the geographers of central Europe, particularly the German, is an interesting fact. It is not to be explained by merely attributing a more liberal spirit to the Portuguese than to the Spanish governments respecting the spread of information concerning the new lands discovered. There is suggested, by the fact of that great influence, a lively intercourse, commercial and otherwise, between Germany and Portugal in those years, and the nature of that intercourse is a subject worthy of more careful study.

One can no longer doubt with Nordenskiöld the marked ability and influence of Waldseemüller. Clearly his maps of 1507 and 1516 are his best work, yet his map of Europe bearing the date 1511, but recently found, and his contributions to the Strasburg edition of Ptolemy entitle him to a place of first rank. We now know very much of the extent of his influence on his contemporaries and his successors of the century, and the list of those who copied him more or less slavishly is a long one. In the amount of positive information that these maps give concerning the status of geographical knowledge in the early years of the sixteenth century may be found no small part of their historical value. An astonishingly large part of the literature of early American cartography needs careful revision since the issue of this volume of facsimiles.

E. L. STEVENSON.

*The Opening of the Mississippi: a Struggle for Supremacy in the American Interior.* By FREDERICK AUSTIN OGG, Instructor in History in Indiana University. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Co. 1904. Pp. xi, 670.)

THIS book is itself a monograph showing the efforts of four nations through three centuries to discover and settle, develop, and control the Mississippi valley. The narrative begins with the first visits of the Spaniards to the northern shores of the Gulf of Mexico and concludes with the admission of the state of Louisiana into the Union with boundaries that embraced a portion of that vague province, "West Florida". The place of the book in a classified bibliography is between the general works such as Wilson's or McMaster's (for the period which McMaster and Ogg have in common) on the one hand, and, on the other, the monographs of Parkman, Thwaites, and Winsor on the French discoverers, Gayarré's *History of Louisiana*, Hosmer's *History of the Louisiana Purchase*, or

Adams's *History of the United States*. It is fuller and more connected than the first class, uninterrupted by excursions into other fields. It is less detailed and exhaustive than the other class. How could it be otherwise within the limits of six hundred and fifty-odd pages of text?

The style is that of the simple, straightforward narrative. It flows almost as smoothly over matters involving disputed fact and interpretation as over the well-accepted views. The author states the best approved opinion, generally relegating controversy to the foot-notes, where the opposing views are briefly stated with references.

The author makes no pretension to having had access to new and unused material or to having discovered a new and improved interpretation of the old material. Foot-notes refer by author and page to the source materials and the secondary authorities with equal copiousness. The reason for the book's existence is that the subject, as conceived by the author, is sufficiently definite and important and interesting to demand treatment as a whole, yet has not hitherto been treated as a whole though many writers have treated one or more phases of it. Here the results of their efforts are put together and unified, the gaps filled up, and the discrepancies harmonized according to the author's best light and judgment. It might be described as a history compiled from the extensive mass of monographs, studies, and papers bearing on the subject, carefully revised and compared with the original sources.

Take the treatment of La Salle as an instance. Chapter IV, "La Salle and the Opening of the Great West", fifty-three pages, is preceded by a chapter of thirty-six pages on "The Search of the French for the Mississippi", and it is followed by a chapter of equal length on "The Exploration of the Upper Mississippi". This is the position and the proportion of space allotted to the famous explorer. Compare with this the mass of "source material" cited in foot-notes and here sufficiently indicated by the names of French, Thwaites, Margry, Shea, not to add more; and the secondary material of Parkman, Winsor, Monette, and many lesser contributors. The reader who came to the book to find an exhaustive and critical study of La Salle would be disappointed. What the author intended, and what we find, is not a study of his career under the microscope—in minute detail, but rather with the field-glass, in distant perspective. So with any other chapter. "The Louisiana Purchase" is the eleventh of the fourteen chapters and occupies forty-four pages. Yet there are on almost every page exact references to twenty-two different authorities in the aggregate, such as the *American State Papers*, *The Writings of Jefferson*, *The Annals of Congress*, or Adams's *History of the United States* (which devotes eleven chapters to this subject), and Hosmer's *History of the Louisiana Purchase*.

Finally, it is a book to inform and entertain the reader and to stimulate in him an interest in the sources and more elaborate studies. What it purports to do it does, not faultlessly, but commendably; and no reader who considers both the scope of the title and the size of the book need be disappointed in its contents.

FREDERICK W. MOORE.

*A History of Louisiana.* By ALCÉE FORTIER, Litt. D., Professor in Tulane University of Louisiana, President of the Louisiana Historical Society. In four volumes: I. Early Explorers and the Domination of the French, 1512-1768. II. The Spanish Domination and the Cession to the United States, 1769-1803. III. The American Domination (part I), 1803-1861. IV. The American Domination (part II), 1861-1903. (Paris and New York: Manzi, Joyant, and Company. 1904. Pp. xix, 268; xiv, 342; xiii, 272; xiii, 299.)

WITH the possible exception of Texas, Louisiana, with her changing boundaries, has had, in some respects, the most romantic and varied history of any American state. These four handsome volumes contain, in a sense, the story of a region rather than of a commonwealth. Picturesque Spanish explorers were in the country which La Salle afterward styled "Louisiane", as early as 1519, when Alvarez de Pineda is thought by many historians to have discovered the Mississippi — by others, the Mobile. There is no evidence that Jolliet and Marquette had any knowledge of Spanish predecessors on the Mississippi; theirs was as much a discovery as was that of Columbus, who had been preceded upon our continent nearly five centuries by Norwegian vikings from Iceland. Dr. Fortier concedes La Salle's discovery of the Ohio in 1671, but discredits the oft-repeated story of his entering the Mississippi prior to Jolliet and Marquette. La Salle's ill-fated career is but briefly treated in the work before us, the history of Louisiana proper being considered as commencing with the enduring settlement of Iberville, Bienville, and Sauvole at Biloxi (1699). These three sons of Charles le Moyne firmly planted the new colony, and may well be regarded as the fathers of Louisiana. Iberville and Sauvole soon passing away, Bienville remained until 1743 as the principal historical figure. Others occasionally occupied the post of governor; but Bienville, as devoted and disinterested as Champlain, was throughout this long period the chief actor, and powerfully and beneficently influenced the colony. During his long supremacy the wide-stretching region of Louisiana was the scene of many fruitful and stirring events. His successor, Marquis de Vaudreuil — "le grand marquis" — was much of the time engaged in disputes with his colleagues; nevertheless considerable progress was made under his administration, best of all being the introduction of the sugar-cane (1751), "one of the greatest benefits ever rendered Louisiana". Two years later he was succeeded by Kerlérec, whom our author does not think dishonest, although his contemporaries, with whom this choleric person frequently quarreled, stoutly declared that he "had not come to the colony for a change of air". New Orleans and its neighboring settlements, although far from the seat of decisive military operations, were indirectly much affected by the French and Indian War. The neighboring tribes were in a constant state of ferment, and could only be kept

from laying their hands on the whites by continual showers of presents and by the fostering of tribal jealousies, which latter duty Kerlérec appears to have performed with some skill; while threatened English attacks frequently racked the nerves of the colonists.

The loss of Canada induced Louis XV, to whom Louisiana had been a considerable expense, to dispose of the latter province to Spain by the secret treaty of Fontainebleau, November 3, 1762. Louisianians were much incensed when they learned in the spring of 1764 that they had been handed over to a new master; but it was two years later before the Spanish governor, Don Antonio de Ulloa, arrived at New Orleans. Ulloa managed the people badly, and by arbitrary conduct aroused intense opposition to Spanish authority. The French court was passionately appealed to by the New Orleans people to take them back again; and when this petition was ignored, the obnoxious governor was packed on board of a vessel (November 1, 1768) and ordered out of the country, a proceeding in which were involved "some of the most influential men in the colony". The conspiracy aroused the Spanish monarch, and the following summer there arrived at New Orleans Don Alejandro O'Reilly as governor and captain-general of the province, backed by a frigate and twenty-three transports, with three thousand soldiers. The chiefs of the revolution were arrested, several of them shot, and others confined in the castle at Havana.

Under Ulloa French political methods had been retained, but O'Reilly introduced Spanish law and governmental modes, and instituted a *cabildo*. Execrated by the colonists because of his unnecessarily harsh treatment of the revolutionists of 1768, although otherwise a man of some judgment, "Bloody O'Reilly" was succeeded by the mild and humane Unzaga (1770), who soothed the Creoles into a fair measure of contentment with Spanish rule. He was followed (1777) by the gallant and indefatigable Galvez, who, in due course, made way (1785) for Miró, who, misled by the scheming Wilkinson — whose unsavory record our author does not shield, despite the fact that some of Wilkinson's descendants are fellow-residents of New Orleans — entertained hopes of separating the trans-Alleghenians of Kentucky and Tennessee from the Federal Union. Miró and his "business like, vigilant, and judicious" successor, Carondelet (1791), figure largely in our diplomatic history because of their connection with the disputed navigation of the Mississippi and the temporary disaffection of the West. Professor Turner's ample study of the American, French, and Spanish documents in the case is not cited by our author, and apparently has not been examined, there being a rather inadequate treatment of this episode, which was so full of menace for the Union by threatening its early westward expansion. This was a period abounding also in Indian disturbances and other interesting events — a threatened attack from the British in Canada, an uprising of the slaves (1795), the cession of the Natchez district to the United States (1797), and an epidemic at New Orleans. With the coming of the impecunious but kind and affable Governor

Gayoso de Lemos (1797), friction arose with the United States because of the governor's arbitrary regulations regarding American commerce through the port of New Orleans; but he died after two years in office, and the affair had meanwhile blown over.

Before the appointment of a new governor, Spain, under moral pressure from Napoleon, retroceded Louisiana to France by the secret treaty of San Ildefonso, October 1, 1800. The story is familiar, in the present centennial period, of the first consul's ambition to found another New France in North America, of the thwarting of this disturbing project by his threatened war with England, of his sale of Louisiana to the United States, the picturesque transfers at New Orleans and St. Louis, the exploration of the trans-Mississippi by Lewis and Clark, and the speedy settlement of the country by American enterprise. With the division of Upper Louisiana into territories of the United States, the story of Louisiana is thereafter confined practically to the present boundaries of the commonwealth, but still abounds in notable incidents. Dr. Fortier devotes much space to the somewhat troublous process of adapting the commonwealth to American political methods, which were quite foreign to Creole habits if not taste. The Burr conspiracy has a considerable claim upon his attention, also the stirring incidents of the War of 1812; the Mexican War, which closely affected Louisiana interests, receives slighter notice; but the War of Secession is waged through three chapters of detail, and the dark period of Reconstruction is accorded similar space. Referring to the discontinuance of the use of the Federal Army for the purpose of upholding state governments (1877), and of President Hayes's subsequent congratulatory message to Congress on the "significant and encouraging" results of the hands-off policy, the author says: "The fortunate situation in the Southern States mentioned by the President might have been obtained eight years sooner if the people had been allowed their constitutional right of self-government" (IV, 194-195).

Since the resumption of constitutional government, the progress of the state has been rapid and uninterrupted, the concluding chapters being devoted to the pleasing story of material development, and to the growth of culture as exhibited in her literary productivity (chiefly in French), and her large and numerous educational institutions. The final paragraph foreshadows the celebration of the centennial of the treaty of cession of Louisiana to the United States, in December, 1903, when "Thanks will be rendered to the Almighty for the blessings enjoyed by the millions living in the vast country watered by the great Mississippi and its tributaries, to which the heroic La Salle gave the immortal name of 'Louisiane'".

This latest history of Louisiana comes to us in four tall octavo volumes handsomely bound in red morocco backs and corners, with marbled paper sides and gilt tops, and printed on heavy deckle-edged paper. It contains ninety-six photogravure illustrations by Goupil and Company, among which are "86 contemporary portraits from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries, among them being many which have

never before been reproduced and were not known to exist". Either in the text or in the notes — which latter are grouped at the end of each volume, instead of being given as foot-notes, where they could easily be consulted — there are included "the original text of all the treaties which concerned Louisiana, France, Spain, and the United States"; the portraits include "everyone connected officially with the transfer, including Jefferson (painted in 1803); Bonaparte (painted in 1803); Robert Livingston and James Monroe, the American ministers; Barbe-Marbois, Decrès, and Talleyrand, the French ministers; Laussat, the French colonial prefect, who actually made the transfer at New Orleans, December 20, 1803; and James Wilkinson and W. C. C. Claiborne, who received the territory in the name of the United States".

All this array is sufficiently attractive, and will doubtless secure buyers; but we must confess to a certain disappointment with the text. In others of Dr. Fortier's writings concerning Louisiana and its people we have found an easy, flowing, illuminating style, which may often be deemed charming. The present work indicates either haste — despite the fact that the publishers assure us that it has been three years in preparation — or a misapprehension of the historical proprieties. There was an opportunity here for a safe middle course between the dry recitation of Martin and the pyrotechnics of Gayarré; and this is what we might naturally have expected of the author of *Louisiana Studies*. Instead, we have a rather hard and formal manner, seldom exhibiting the author's natural grace of diction and, worst of all, almost wholly lacking in what is called "atmosphere". Throughout his long recital of political and military events our author in few places, and then but briefly, seeks to lift the curtain upon life and manners among his historic Louisianians — the very sort of thing which Dr. Fortier is surely capable of doing, and for which his admirers will first search through these four superbly-appointed volumes. It would seem as though the gifted president of the Louisiana Historical Society feared lest his imagination, if given rein, might play him tricks in this new field of study, and hence had best be curbed and blinded.

We do not find our author tripping seriously in his sturdy plodding through the wilderness of facts. He appears to have observed his sources to good purpose; but fewer long and often tedious citations from original documents and from the pages of his predecessors Martin and Gayarré, and a freer presentation of his own views, together with a better sense of differentiation between matter desirable for text and that only suitable for notes or an appendix, would have resulted in a more acceptable piece of book-making. As we have already intimated, mechanically and from the point of view of dignified and appropriate illustration, the volumes are well worthy of the centennial of the Louisiana purchase.

R. G. THWAITES.



*Lectures on European History.* By WILLIAM STUBBS, D.D., formerly Bishop of Oxford and Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. Edited by ARTHUR HASSALL, M. A. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1904. Pp. viii, 424.)

THESE thirty-four lectures were delivered at Oxford between 1860 and 1870. They cover the political and military history of the period of the Reformation and the Thirty Years' War on the continent. Of the eleven lectures in part I, "The Emperor Charles V", only two are devoted to the Reformation. Even in these the author proclaims his intention "in this course to steer clear of the religious part of the Reformation history: as clear as I can". The chief actor is Charles, and the chapter devoted to "The Character of Charles V", is one of the most balanced and interesting in the book. Luther receives the briefest possible mention half a dozen times, Zwingli is mentioned once, and Calvin not at all. Part II, "The Political History of Europe from the Resignation of Charles V", is about equally divided among Germany, France, and Spain and the Netherlands. "Henry IV.'s Place in the History of Europe" is the most interesting and valuable chapter here; "I place him above Philip, on a par with Elizabeth, and far below William the Silent" (p. 246). Part III, "The Political History of Europe during the Thirty Years' War", the author confesses, "has not answered exactly to the title"; "whilst we have given a good deal of attention to the drum and trumpet part of the story we have been obliged rather to cut short the political commentary" (p. 386).

These three parts Bishop Stubbs regarded as three acts "of a great series", with "two distinct ideas in progress which may be regarded as giving a unity to the long period. The Reformation is one, the claims of the house of Hapsburg the other. On the whole, the history of the house of Hapsburg is the string on which most certainly the unity of the history arranges itself" (p. 404). Following this thread, the lecturer gives a very sympathetic but temperate and fair-minded picture of the Hapsburg rulers and their policy. In the Thirty Years' War he judges the "Catholic princes infinitely superior in political and moral energy to the Protestant ones" (p. 406).

The lectures give a calm and dispassionate account of a great period, by a scholar of wide reading and sound judgment. The book is weighty and learned rather than brilliant, and abounds in facts rather than in generalizations or interpretations. Probably the most valuable feature is Bishop Stubbs's estimate of the great men of the era, where he displays his judicial temper, or what one of his well-known pupils is fond of describing as "an unequalled power of sitting on the fence". The two exceptions are the severe judgments of Francis I and of the Puritans. The lectures do not "attempt any original research" (p. 7). It would be hardly fair to compare them with the scholarly investigations of the last generation of continental, English, and American scholars, or to expect



them to make any positive contribution to the present stock of knowledge. It would be fairer to compare them with the lectures delivered by Häusser at Heidelberg, and edited by Oncken nearly forty years ago.

The book is so crowded with detail as to be frequently too much like an encyclopedia or even an epitome. An extreme example of these faults is on page 159. Here are some sixty proper names, thirty-nine dates, and two very puzzling and not entirely accurate descriptions of the Guise and Bourbon families. All this could have been given more clearly and correctly and far more usefully for reference in genealogical tables.

The two lines devoted to Richelieu's terms at Rochelle (p. 389), the five lines to the Edict of Amboise of 1563 (p. 185) are inadequate and misleading; the six lines devoted to the Edict of Nantes are inadequate in the statements of both what was given and what was reserved (p. 240). Space for fuller treatment of these and other subjects could easily and profitably have been made by omissions in the "enormous mass of afflicting details", and "the sufficiently tough reading" which the lecturer with delightful and judicious candor admits characterize his treatment of the Thirty Years' War (pp. 375, 402).

The editing leaves something to be desired. There are half a dozen sentences or clauses which lack verbs, or are otherwise unintelligible, and as many more which are obscure or contradictory. A few incorrect dates, half a dozen other minor errors, and the presence of undesirable colloquialisms make up a total of nearly two score minor blemishes or errors which the lecturer would undoubtedly have removed and which would have disappeared before a proof-reading more painstaking and worthy of the scholarship manifested in the lectures. The eleven notes are of the most meager nature. There is no attempt at bibliography of any sort. The sole reference to recent literature is to Pollard's *Henry VIII*. The very poor index of fourteen pages is followed by forty pages of advertisements.

In spite of the inevitable limitations of university lectures written a generation ago, and of the avoidable defects of editing, Bishop Stubbs's lectures show sound learning and unbiased judgment in a period where these qualities are preëminently needed.

HERBERT DARLING FOSTER.

*Storia degli Scavi di Roma e Notizie intorno le Collezioni Romane di Antichità.* Per RODOLFO LANCIANI. Volume II, a. 1531-1549. (Rome: Ermanno Loescher e Co. 1903. Pp. 265.)

WHILE the first volume<sup>1</sup> of this important work covered a period of more than 400 years (1000-1530), the second covers only the following eighteen (1531-1549), including the last four years of the pontificate of Clement VII and the whole of that of Paul III. This short period was fertile in the discovery of archaeological remains, largely in conse-

<sup>1</sup> See AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, April, 1903 (VIII, 522-523).

quence of the municipal improvements due to the energy of Alexander Farnese and of his efficient coadjutor, Giovenale Latino Mannetti, who opened thirteen new streets in the city and has been called by Lanciani the Haussmann of Rome. The character of these improvements, and the slight expense incurred by the municipality in making them, are contrasted favorably with the reckless extravagance and oftentimes inartistic results of the last thirty years.

The first volume of the *Storia* was arranged according to a strict chronological system that rendered it necessary to look up many references in order to trace the history of the excavations on any one site through a series of years. Just criticism of this arrangement has led the author to modify the method somewhat and to adopt the following scheme: the entries are divided into three parts, those relating to the excavations themselves, those relating to the museums and collections, and those relating to the removal and subsequent history of works of art. In the second place, all the notices occurring in each century which relate to one building, group of buildings, or site are arranged together under the year where the first notice belongs. Thus, in the period under review, the first notice of excavations on the site of the *palazzo Farnese* occurs in 1542, and the following twenty-eight pages are devoted to the history of succeeding discoveries on the same site down to the close of the sixteenth century. The history of each century is to be kept distinct. This change has materially increased the usefulness and convenience of the book, converting it from a mere storehouse of facts into a work which is often very readable. The indexes have also been improved. A second result of this change in arrangement is that this volume, while nominally covering only eighteen years, really covers the rest of the century in the case of many structures.

Some indication of the relative importance of the discoveries on different sites during the seventy years from 1530 to 1600 may be given by the amount of space devoted to them in this volume. Forty pages are occupied with the discoveries in the Forum and on the *Sacra via*, twenty-two with those on the Palatine, fifteen with those in the baths of Diocletian, and twenty-eight with those in the *palazzo Farnese*, while thirty pages are devoted to the account of the building of the *palazzo dei Conservatori* and the additions to the Capitoline collections.

The most interesting, and at the same time painful, section is that which deals with the discoveries made in the Forum. When Charles V entered Rome in triumph, April 5, 1536, a new street was built from the Arch of Titus across the Forum to the Arch of Severus, which caused the destruction of numerous medieval buildings and of some ancient remains. Four years later Paul III granted the exclusive right of excavating within and without the city to those in charge of the construction of St. Peter's, who wanted the marble and travertine for building purposes. The consequences were most disastrous, for the Forum valley was worked precisely like a quarry, and during the next decade not only were many parts of the ancient monuments which still projected above the level of

the ground removed, but the process of destruction was carried on in extensive excavations. Had it not been for the havoc wrought during these ten years, the present condition of the Forum would be as different as possible, and very considerable remains of at least ten buildings would still be standing.

This is not the place to enter into any discussion of the topographical questions involved in the account of the excavations, but attention may be called in passing to the convincing evidence accumulated by Lanciani that the *Vivarium* was close to the *castra Praetoria* and not near the *porta Praenestina*. The author is to be congratulated again upon both the form and the matter of this notable work.

S. B. PLATNER.

*The Life and Letters of the Great Earl of Cork.* By DOROTHEA TOWNSHEND. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company; London: Duckworth and Company. 1904. Pp. xvi, 531.)

THIS volume is a real contribution to the history of Ireland not so much on the political as on the economic side. Richard Boyle, an English adventurer of the type of Raleigh and Drake, sought his fortune in Ireland as Raleigh sought his in America. In that country of misrule and revolt he found both honor and fortune, and was known by his contemporaries as the Great Earl of Cork, as though the adjective were a rightful part of his title.

For the present work Miss Townshend has had an abundance of material. The Great Earl of Cork was the ancestor of the Duke of Devonshire, the Earl of Cork and Orrery, the Earl of Shannon, Lord Barrymore, Lord Digby, and the Duke of Leinster; and in these families have been preserved the letters and papers from which this history has been drawn. The most valuable papers are in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire, who descends from the earl's eldest son; they are preserved at Lismore Castle. These papers were edited by Dr. Grosart and privately printed in ten volumes — five containing the Great Earl's diary and five containing letters to him from his family and friends, with some of his replies. From these volumes Miss Townshend has drawn the greater part of her material; but she has supplemented it from autobiographies of the earl's children and from other family papers, from county histories, and from Caulfield's city council books.

The work throws some additional light on Irish political history under Queen Elizabeth and the first two Stuarts. Court intrigues and enmities between the servants of the queen and her successors, as related here, help to an understanding of both home and foreign politics; but all such matters are treated only incidentally. Miss Townshend's endeavor has been to create a living personality in the earl, and to give just as much of his environment and as much about his contemporaries as is necessary to this end. Many of the pages are taken up with what from the point of view of the political student must be considered trivialities

—courtships and marriages in the earl's family; visits, ceremonial and friendly; debts and difficulties of his sons and sons-in-law; family bills; and presents and their cost. We learn also about the education of the earl's sons and wards; their journeys to London and their presentation at court; their occasional illnesses, and even the physicking they endured. In short, we have a very full and detailed picture of life in the families of the wealthy at the close of the sixteenth and the opening of the seventeenth century; and the student of social conditions will here gather much that is useful to him.

It is, however, to the student of economic conditions in Ireland that the book will appeal most strongly. The Great Earl found his fortune in the province of Munster. Little by little he became the greatest landowner in that part of Ireland; and he found the land a land of plenty and by no means the poverty-stricken, distressful country we are apt to consider it. The rivers were rich in fish and pearls; the mountains in silver, copper, and iron ore and in timber, good for ship-building and for barrel staves. We are told that Richard Boyle was paid £4,600 for bar-iron exported to Amsterdam in 1623, and for silver mines leased in 1631 he received a rent in kind consisting of a fair basin and ewer, four dozen large silver plates, and eight great candlesticks. The earl also introduced tobacco culture into Ireland and set up glass and woolen works in his town of Youghal. In Youghal and also in his other three towns of Lismore, Bandon Bridge, and Clonakilty, which all owed their existence as towns to him, he settled English families; and it was English not Irish industry which made this part of Ireland for a while so busy and prosperous. The Great Earl was no better than his times in his attitude toward the native and Catholic Irish; but it is hard to decide whether it was for economic or religious reasons that he so rigorously excluded Catholics from his town demesnes. For many reasons the *Life of the Great Earl of Cork* is valuable as a contribution to Irish history of the period of the English plantation of Ireland.

A. G. PORRITT.

*England in the Mediterranean: a Study of the Rise and Influence of British Power within the Straits, 1603-1713.* By JULIAN S. CORBETT. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1904. Two vols., pp. ix, 342; ii, 351.)

THE author of this book belongs to the imperialistic school of historians, who write history with a tendency, and history with a tendency is not history, but a sermon based upon historic facts in the nature of things falsely apprehended. For Mr. Corbett sea-power is the supreme fact, and sea-power in the Mediterranean is the supremest of all facts. Consequently in his opinion England should have endeavored to be a Mediterranean power long before she became one. As a corollary, all English politicians who regarded the Mediterranean as a fit field for English action were great statesmen; all who did not so regard it were

purblind creatures. In other words, he regards the entire past as having existed merely to create the society in which we live, as if this society were the last word to be spoken throughout all the ages. Whereas, if anything is certain, it is that the present condition of affairs, like all precedent conditions, is but a transition to another in which perhaps the Mediterranean policy of England will be as bitterly condemned by some future historian with a tendency as it is now lauded by Mr. Corbett. The statesmen of 300 years ago are not to be judged by the policies and ideas which prevail to-day. Statesmen ought to work for their day and not for any remote future, and historians ought to write for all time and not for any immediate present.

Another grievous shortcoming is the writer's insistence that, "as a rule, what did not happen is at least as important as what did". In what sense this is true it would be difficult to determine. It is certainly logical, however, if one holds the doctrine, to infer from it that its neglect has led to the ignoring of "the sweeping change in the European system which accompanied the appearance of Great Britain in the Mediterranean". The last sentence furnishes the clue to another vital error into which the writer constantly falls — a vulgar error of logical method, which consists in supposing that because two things occur in conjunction, therefore one occurs because of the other. It may be that England's appearance in the Mediterranean was accompanied by great changes in the European system, but the presumption that the appearance of England in the Mediterranean was the cause of these changes is unwarranted.

Finally, though Mr. Corbett has written several books, he is not a historian. He takes history seriously and he delves in the records, but he has little conception of what the writing of history really demands. It is not enough "to scorn delights and live laborious days" — one must also know what is the exact bearing of evidence in a given case, and in how far he can trust his authorities. That the writer has not a conception of these demands upon the historian it would be unjust to assert, but his use of his material is not scholarly. He gives references only semi-occasionally; his authorities do not always bear him out in his conclusions, and he does not weigh the evidence with anything like the skill, accuracy, and judgment demanded of a historian.

These general criticisms admit of constant proof throughout the work. Thus he takes Pepys's assertions when they are to his taste and rejects them when they are not, as in the case of Tangier, which Pepys rightly held to be untenable. His remarks on Captain Mainwaring are confused and are not supported by at least one of the authorities he quotes. The early Stuart period was a "colourless waste", in which only one naval expedition of any consequence was despatched. This was a "contemptible failure" in its declared object but it had an undeclared object "which gave the keynote of the century" (I, 3-4). It was the occasion on which "the navy of England first appeared in the Mediterranean". To assert that Cecil's expedition gave any such key-

note; that it had any influence in bringing England permanently into the Mediterranean; that it led any one anywhere at any time to regard the Mediterranean as a fit field for English naval enterprise is to assert what has no basis in fact. Again, the pirate Ward is held up to admiration because in his piratical excursions into the Mediterranean he was instrumental in causing the despatch of a Spanish fleet of "broadside ships" for the first time into that sea. This "marks a turning-point in naval history" (I, 16). Moreover, Ward by his acts in the Mediterranean begins the work which William III and Marlborough complete. It seems incredible that any one can believe that, without Ward, broadside ships would not have been used by Spain in the Mediterranean about the time when they were, or that Ward can in any sense be regarded as the originator of the work completed by Marlborough. Another pirate, Sir Walter Raleigh, is equally lauded, but with quite as little reason. Corbett admits that Raleigh was a pirate, but piracy was not then discreditable, "no more to be reprehended than is a secret treaty now" (I, 41). Such assertions are often met with, but they are false. Piracy was regarded as discreditable even in the age of Elizabeth. Raleigh, Corbett admits, was anxious to break the peace with Spain, and this was laudable because "it was the Reformation and the freedom of the New World that were at stake" (I, 42). This assertion is almost grotesque, for "the Reformation and the freedom of the New World" in no way depended upon a war between England and Spain at that moment. This is evident, because there was no war, and yet "the Reformation and the freedom of the New World" survived. It is impossible moreover to see how Raleigh had anything to do with the Mediterranean. It is true that Gondomar feared that Raleigh had designs upon that sea, but no such designs were actually held, so far as known. Mr. Corbett supposes that Gondomar's fear influenced Spanish naval policy materially, but there is no evidence of this.

Another epoch-making event is the permission given by King James to the Venetians in 1618 to hire a dozen English merchant-ships to assist their navy in the Adriatic. These ships were never secured, and King James gave a similar permission to the Spaniards. Yet Mr. Corbett holds that the Venetian attempt to hire ships led to the failure of Osuna to assist the so-called "Spanish Conspiracy" in Venice. Why? Because the Venetians attempted to hire the ships and the plot failed, failed because Osuna could not assist because the Spanish government was afraid of the English ships which never came. What makes this concatenation of causes and effects still more wonderful is that Mr. Corbett produces no evidence to show that Osuna was in any way connected with the plot, if there was a plot. All is assumption. Tremendous as was the immediate result of this small event, its real significance was yet more so, for "to all the strange aspects of that famous plot we must add one more, and see in it the first occasion on which England by her new sea power laid a mastering hand upon the old centres of dominion and had dimly revealed to her her most potent line of political action"



(I, 65). Naturally, since the premises are pure guesswork, the conclusion is pure nonsense, and one is not surprised on turning the page to find the author admitting that "at first sight it may appear that too much importance has been attached" to this episode. To this all may agree, especially when it is recalled that while the English ships stayed at home, the Dutch hired a dozen vessels to the Venetians. The uninitiated would suppose that credit, if due, is due the Dutch. Mr. Corbett evidently suspects it, for in combating the view he declares that it is "probable that the moral effect of the English demonstration had at least as much weight with the Mediterranean powers as the actual force exhibited by the Dutch" (I, 67-68). After the sentence quoted above about England's "new sea power" this is indeed "a lame and impotent conclusion", but the case can be paralleled over and over again in Mr. Corbett's work. The tremendous importance of an event or of a no-event is insisted upon, and then the reader finds embedded somewhere a dozen pages further along a second conclusion garnished with "ifs and ans", "sage provisos, sub-intents and saving clauses".

In 1618 the English prepared a squadron to enter the Mediterranean and attack the pirates there. What became of this squadron Mr. Corbett does not know. It does not appear to have gone anywhere or to have done anything, although two Dutch squadrons entered the Mediterranean about this time, and engaged and defeated a Spanish force. Conclusion: "the naval intervention of England and her ally in the Mediterranean had been a complete success" (I, 88). In 1621 Mansell enters the Mediterranean and fails in an attack upon Algiers. Conclusion: "the lesson was never forgotten, either at home or abroad; nor from that time forth did the potentiality of English action in the Mediterranean ever cease to be a factor in European diplomacy" (I, 133). In 1624 Richelieu requests James I to assist France with a fleet in the Mediterranean. This is "nothing else than an invitation from France to England that she should assert her yet unmeasured influence on continental policy by naval operations in the Mediterranean", and Richelieu, if he possessed prophetic vision, "must have lain uneasy the night he let the proposal go" (I, 138). Undoubtedly, although the ships "were to sail under the French flag, and to be in all respects a French force". The expedition never sailed, but it deserves mention, presumably because "as a rule, what does not happen is at least as important as what does".

These examples well illustrate the writer's fitness for his task, in so far at least as his work relates to the first half of the seventeenth century. Everywhere he is incoherent, self-contradictory; everywhere he emphasizes unimportant men and still more unimportant events; everywhere he sees the finger of destiny whenever the Mediterranean is mentioned by an Englishman. The work improves, however, as the writer comes down toward the close of the century. The treatment of Cromwell's operations in the Mediterranean is good; the story of Tangier is well told, although the author naturally overrates the importance of that posses-



sion. The truth is that Tangier was not, on his own showing, worth the keeping. The naval strategy of William III and of Marlborough is justly appreciated and clearly expounded; the real bearing of the Spanish succession question for England is recognized, while the story of the capture of Gibraltar is excellently told. The reason for this improvement in the writer's work is clear. He has reached a period in which England actually had a Mediterranean policy, and in which her acts in the Mediterranean actually had a significance for the future. He has also reached a period in which he no longer needs to trust to conjecture, but can build upon admitted facts.

R. C. H. CATTERALL.

*The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898.* Edited by EMMA HELEN BLAIR and JAMES A. ROBERTSON. Vol. XIV, 1605-1609. Vol. XV, 1609. (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company. 1904. Pp. 341, 331.)

WE get, in Volume XIV, echoes of the strife between Archbishop Benavides and Governor-General Acuña, related also with the Chinese disturbances and the massacre of some 15,000 to 18,000 Chinese in Luzon in 1603. In consequence of this massacre and of the failure of the Spaniards to restore all the confiscated property of Chinese, a viceroy of China threatens in 1605 to come to Manila with a thousand junks and sweep the Spaniards out of the Orient. To his boast that his king governs all the land on which the moon and sun shine, Acuña answers that

the Spaniards have measured by palmos, and that very exactly, all the countries belonging to all the kings and lordships in the world. Since the Chinese have no commerce with foreign nations, it seems to them that there is no other country but their own, and that there is no higher greatness than theirs; but if he knew the power of some of the kings with whom my sovereign, the king of the Hespañas, carries on continual war, the whole of China would seem to him very small (p. 46).

We get also some hints in this volume of the Spanish efforts for the conversion of the Japanese, and some indications of why they failed, both in religious and commercial undertakings, in Japan. It is interesting to find the Council of the Indies saying in 1607 (p. 229): "It is well to keep the king of Japon friendly. . . . For if he were not so he would be the greatest enemy that could be feared, on account of the number and size of his realms, and the valor of the people therein, who are, beyond comparison, the bravest in all India."

Perhaps the most interesting of the documents presented in this volume (which are drawn mainly from the Seville archives, with a few also from the British Museum, the Simancas archives, the Royal Academy of History at Madrid, and the National Historical Archives at Madrid) is the account of the various expeditions in 1591 and 1607-1608 to Tuy, land of the head-hunters of Northern Luzon, through the very regions which a recent "explorer", A. H. Savage Landor, has described as if he were the first white man to see them. The editors' note about the Igor-

rotes (p. 302) contains some errors (drawn from Blumentritt and such careless writers as Foreman and Sawyer) which show the present unsatisfactory state of knowledge about Philippine ethnology.

Of great value also is the document drawn up in 1608 showing the annual receipts and expenditures of the Philippine government, revealing a total expenditure of 255,000 pesos, leaving a deficit of 135,000 pesos. This was covered apparently by the annual remittances (later known as *situados*) from the treasury of the viceroyalty of New Spain (Mexico). A note on page 247 recites Professor E. G. Bourne's statement (in the introduction to this series) that the annual deficit of the Philippines, as of other Spanish colonies, was made up by the treasury of Mexico; but the statement of the English traveler Bowring (1859) is also given, to the effect that the Philippines generally made annual contributions to Spain in excess of the *situados*. The same matter is more fully explained in Felipe Govantes's *Compendio de la Historia de Filipinas* (Manila, 1877), appendix 23, where it is stated that the export dues on goods sent from Manila to Spain (through America) were collected at Acapulco, and turned into the treasury of Mexico, which in turn supplied that of Manila with the amount necessary to make up its annual "deficit". (See T. H. Pardo de Tavera's *Biblioteca Filipina*, 193.) Before accepting the figures given by Humboldt, who did not take into account the curious Spanish restrictions on the commerce of her American and Philippine colonies, it is necessary to have the data regarding the Philippine trade and the duties collected on it. It was thus that Roscher was led astray in his *Kolonien, Kolonialpolitik und Auswanderung*, the chapter of which on the Spanish colonial system has recently been published by Professor Bourne, who seems to have followed Roscher in this matter of colonial revenues. The whole question will bear careful investigation, but the never exact system of Spanish accounts renders precision in this respect difficult. After Mexico became independent and direct intercourse between Spain and the Philippines was established, the latter colony furnished the mother-country, during some years at least, with a surplus. It is also to be taken into account that the goods of Spain had free entry into the islands.

This very volume produces (p. 216) the following argument in the Spanish Council of State, the question being the restriction or abolition of Philippine trade with China and with Mexico: "The preservation of the Indias consisted in this, that, through their need of articles which are not produced there, they always depend upon this country [Spain]; and it would be the means of losing them if their wants could be supplied elsewhere."

Volume XV is nearly all taken up by seven of the eight chapters of Doctor Antonio de Morga's *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* (Mexico, 1609), the most valuable of the early sources on Philippine history and the customs of the natives. Chapter VIII, which will be reproduced in the succeeding volume, is of the greatest interest, because of its observations upon the natives' laws and customs, their conversion, etc. These seven chapters

contain the Philippine history from 1565 to 1603, producing entire many documents of interest covering the years of de Morga's official service in the islands. The editors have used the copy belonging to Harvard University, and have drawn freely on the annotations of José Rizal in the Paris reprint of 1890, also to some extent on those of Henry E. J. Stanley's English translation (London, 1868). They append also summaries of Thomas Candish's expedition and of early Dutch voyages to the East Indies. These volumes contain some interesting reproductions of early Dutch prints of vessels and of the port of Acapulco.

JAMES A. LE ROY.

*Two Centuries of Costume in America.* By ALICE MORSE EARLE. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1903. Two vols., pp. xx, 388; xxiii, 389-824.)

HOWEVER eager one is to come into Alice Morse Earle's kingdom of colonial daily life lore as a visitor, critics might well be loath to come if experience had not shown that much of their criticism is likely to be favorable. In her studies of colonial institutions, whether of homes, taverns, gardens, amusements, or dress, Mrs. Earle has brought many byways into the view of students of American history. If any warrant for such a work as this must be produced before a testy historian will deign to examine its pages or attest its value, Mrs. Earle has been forehanded enough to supply it in her quotations from letters, orders, and diaries of men like Governor John Winthrop and George Washington, who are shown to have considered no detail of dress too trivial for attention. Both of these men gave abundant evidence that they agreed with Pepys's entry in his diary: "For Clothes I perceive more and more every day is a great matter". Mrs. Earle has, however, realized relative values and kept the perspective true, and has comprehended how much knowledge of contemporary general history is required to understand the details of the dress of one locality or age. This gives dignity to the work, which can be stamped as a worthy piece of historical research. By mentioning frequently her great-great-grandmother or great-aunts as owning the articles of dress she describes, Mrs. Earle has added personal interest without making the book degenerate into a glorification of her ancestors. And though we can read a romance between the lines here and there, fully conscious that she has felt it too, the printed text is a thoroughly reliable piece of historical work.

A list of the possible and probable uses of this book includes the study not only of the history but of the literature and art of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Its use will be as a handbook or dictionary, helping the student in the interpretation of details. Of course novelists and poets could not give in their narrative or verse the details which on second thoughts the reader wants to know. Scott never clogged his novels with foot-notes. In his *Woodstock*, the vivid picture of the seventeenth-century Commonwealth affairs, where parsons in blue

Geneva cloaks and Cavaliers in love-locks and slashed doublets pass before our eyes, we find ourselves unaccustomed to their attire. We wonder just how a black velvet doublet pinked over scarlet satin would look. We wish we could see the shape of hat on which a golden clasp and feather were worn. Until Mrs. Earle's book appeared I had never been sure whether Scott's heroes were dressed in fanciful, fancy, or ordinary costumes; now I know that Scott described just such costumes as were actually worn. Before a Van Dyke or a Copley portrait one raises questions which this book can happily satisfy, enabling a person to tell another about the details by supplying a suitable vocabulary.

The volume will also be of service in correcting misconceptions as important in their results as they are frequent and wide-spread. Writers of so-called historical novels must be careful of their robing-rooms after this. It will not do to confuse costumes of different centuries and make impossible mixtures of whisks and ruffs. Neither Puritans nor Quakers have always been soberly or meanly clad. Puritans thought much of clothes, of fineries, of styles. Their dress was not dull, drab-colored. "Sad-colors" included browns, russet, purple, and orange. If Winthrop ordered a "sad colored" gown for his wife, it was likely to be of rich purple brocade. Other colors known as "grain colors" included scarlet, which was very much worn throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by all classes and by such quiet-demeanored persons as Judge Curwen of Salem and Elizabeth Fry and her six sisters in their early years.

Mrs. Earle finds good authority for saying that the dress of the Puritans and Cavaliers differed little in quality, quantity, cost, or form. The rich and the poor of each party, however, dressed very differently, and both Hogarth and Van Dyke were true to what they saw. Poor martyrs and royal courtiers differed in appearance and dress not because they were Roundheads or Cavaliers but because of their different stations in life and size of purse. In short, station or rank was marked in the seventeenth century, not only in England but in America, by dress. Governor Winthrop was perfectly consistent in his theory of dressing richly while he advised the General Court of Massachusetts to pass sumptuary laws forbidding people to buy "slashed clothes" or silver hatbands. Not dress but excess in dress was aimed at in all sumptuary laws in the colonies as in England and France. And with the Quakers until the close of the eighteenth century, when Elizabeth Fry set a style generally adopted, it was extravagance in jewels and fashions rather than richness of material or brightness of color that was frowned upon.

Any change made in New England was caused by a similar change of style in England, and not because of a pioneer life environment here. A Virginia gentleman and his wife were apt to be models of fashion whom a London lord and lady might safely follow. Styles for them both came from France via London generally, although the fashion dolls or midgets were sometimes sent direct to America.

The volumes contain scores of interesting facts. The influence of

painters like Van Dyke in the seventeenth and Copley in the eighteenth century made fashions more beautiful for both men and women. Certainly artistic sense was necessary to restrain the excessive and oftentimes grotesque fashions, to lower pompadours, and to laugh to scorn the dress of beribboned and belaced gentlemen. Both men and women were weirdly frivolous then. At least one colonial dame profited by a man's nice discrimination and knowledge of fashion. Through the correspondence of Madame Rebekah Symonds of Ipswich in Massachusetts and her son, John Hall of London, we have a wonderfully interesting source of information about fashions. When his mother sent for fan or cloak, he always knew just what to choose, telling her gently but firmly if what she requested was out of style or undesirable for a woman in her station in life. There were husbands who rivaled their wives in fine clothes and vanity. Endymion Porter wore his wife's diamond necklace on his hat while he was in Spain. One husband picked (ripped) the lace off his wife's old gown to put on his own new costume.

If one makes a few unfavorable criticisms, they will be these. The proportions seem to be lost in discussing Elizabeth's character so fully in connection with Raleigh's dress (p. 21) and, again, in giving the details of Mary Musgrove's life, which seem irrelevant in the chapter "Attire of Virginia Dames and their Neighbors" (p. 131). The title "The Provincial Governors" does not seem quite appropriate for the chapter so-called, since the subject-matter does not justify it. One wishes that the last sentence, giving the Indian anecdote (p. 193), had been omitted, since the unity of time suffers by its presence.

Favorable criticism is constant and definite while one reads these two volumes. The sense of accuracy, the generally good proportions, the frequent reference to source-material on the one hand, an easy, happy style of writing on the other, make this study of colonial costume a pleasant byway to wander in. Since the book is evidently meant for both the general reader and the student of history, the latter suffers most, perhaps, from the lack of such definitely tabulated references as Weeden and Bruce have given in their histories of social and economic conditions in colonial times.

BLANCHE EVANS HAZARD.

*New Hampshire: an Epitome of Popular Government.* By FRANK B. SANBORN. [American Commonwealths.] (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company. 1904. Pp. xi, 354.)

NEW HAMPSHIRE, the second English colony on the New England coast and one of the original thirteen states, has at length been accorded recognition in the "Commonwealths Series" of histories. The work was committed to Frank B. Sanborn, one of the multitude of the loyal natives of the state loaned to Massachusetts, well known as an anti-slavery agitator, a reformer in the department of public charities and corrections, an exponent of the Concord school of philosophy, and a

vigorous and versatile writer in history, biography, and a wide range of other subjects of present interest. Mr. Sanborn has always been specially interested in the early annals of New Hampshire. The present work is characterized by excellent judgment in the apportionment of space to the several epochs which are necessarily the subjects of his attention.

Two controlling elements run through the entire course of events in the colony and province. These are the Masonian contest between the inhabitants and the proprietors of the soil and the related controversy over the Massachusetts boundary line. The philosophy of the real history of the state and, indeed, the causes for the separate existence of the colony are to be apprehended only by a recognition of these two conspicuous and far-reaching influences as the dominant factors in the material and political development of the province. The events of the first or ante-Revolutionary period are treated by this author in the light of painstaking original research. The accessions that have been made in recent years to the available original documents relative to the colonial period have been utilized to good purpose. The text incidentally discloses Mr. Sanborn's conviction that Puritan politics and Puritan laws were as bad as Puritan theology. In this regard his argument is more in conformity with the attitude of Chalmers, Peter Oliver, Brooks Adams, John S. Jenness, and Charles W. Tuttle than with that of Belknap, Palfrey, Dr. Ellis, and Dr. Dexter. Mr. Sanborn develops the workings of Puritan influence in New Hampshire through the political union and by reason of kindred interests of the people of the two colonies. The authorities are judiciously selected and well digested. Those that were not accessible to Dr. Belknap, the first and still the most authoritative historian of the province period, are made to serve their appropriate corrective and illustrative uses.

Mr. Sanborn's treatment of events since the Revolution is as well proportioned as is that devoted to the earlier period, but there are indications of less painstaking care in verification of statements as to facts and incidents in the careers of public men of the state and in local concerns and episodes, which will be readily noted by actual residents who are more intimately identified with the state's politics and other interests by actual participation in them or by investigation as specialists in its local and internal history. It will doubtless move Mr. Sanborn's own lively sense of humor to find that his narrative names the "Poor Richard" as the antagonist of the *Serapis* in Paul Jones's historic sea-fight (p. 215).

The style of the work is graphic and stimulating. It is pervaded by enough of the controversial method to cause readers to take issue with the author or with each other at many points. It will afford critical students of American history a better perspective as to the relations of New Hampshire with the foundations of the main body of that history; it will be recognized as an important contribution to the discussion of a great number of the most important questions that have been hitherto regarded as unsettled; and it will compel a revision of established opin-



ion at many points where the author has brought the search-light of modern critical research and analysis to bear upon his subject.

*North Carolina, a Study in English Colonial Government.* By CHARLES LEE RAPER, Ph.D. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1904. Pp. xiii, 260.)

MR. RAPER'S monograph belongs with Smith's *South Carolina* and Mereness's *Maryland* in the succession of useful studies in colonial administration for which we are indebted not only to their authors but to the scholarly suggestion and guidance of Professor Osgood. Owing to the comparative fullness of documentary material in the *North Carolina Colonial Records*, Mr. Raper has been able more largely than his predecessors to build up his narrative from printed documents, though some manuscript material has been used, chiefly in the chapter on "The Territorial System and Administration". Like Mr. Smith's volume on South Carolina, this book is limited mainly to a study of the royal province, its organization and practical operation. Local administration is hardly touched, and the relations of church and state are passed over with a few references to controversies during the proprietary period. The disadvantages of too close a limitation of the field are perhaps most apparent in the closing chapter, on "The Downfall of the Royal Government". There is much about the governor who defended the interests of his superiors at home, but the Revolutionary party with its leaders appears only in the most shadowy fashion.

After the brief introduction on the proprietary government there is a group of three chapters on the governor, the council, and the town house of the assembly. The organization and general functions of these organs of the central government are here described, and some attention is given to the personal element. Thus in the chapter on "The Governor Under the Crown", the administration of each governor is briefly sketched with some estimate of his character and official success. The royal governors are said, on the whole, "to make a good showing", though "agents of an inefficient system". The council "was in the main a body composed of men of ability, intelligence and honesty". This rather favorable judgment is somewhat weakened by the statement in a later passage (p. 167), that there was a "condition of inefficiency, and even chaos, in the executive, legislative and judicial departments", due partly to "lack of intelligence on the part of the crown", but also "to a lack of intelligence, industry and character on the part of the crown officials in the province" and "a lack of intelligence and energy on the part of the representatives of the colonists". On the eve of the Revolution, the councilors seem to have been, more largely than those of South Carolina, representative colonists and disposed to sympathize with the popular movement.

The next four chapters describe four special departments of administration, the territorial, fiscal, judicial, and military systems, respectively. The main principles of the land-system were laid down in the proprietary



period, partly by the proprietors and partly by the provincial assembly. They continued, however, to be an important subject of controversy during the period of royal government. The author notes the tendency to smaller grants than those of Virginia or South Carolina and gives a good account of the embarrassment resulting from Carteret's retention of his proprietary rights in the northern part of the province. The chapter on the fiscal system is largely taken up with an interesting review of paper-money legislation, but is not on the whole so satisfactory as the corresponding chapter in Smith's *South Carolina*. In describing the courts of justice, the author seems (p. 151) to have confused the court of chancery with the appellate jurisdiction of the governor and council in civil cases.

This review of special departments of administrations is followed by a chapter entitled "The Conflicts Between the Executive and the Lower House Under the Crown". The chief controversies between them are described, but there is not quite the thorough discussion of principles, of political relations and tendencies, which one might expect under such a title. Something of this is supplied in the closing chapter, on "The Downfall of the Royal Government", which is, however, in this as in another respect already noted, somewhat disappointing.

From the point of view of literary, or what may perhaps be called historical construction, this book leaves much to be desired. Thus the chapter on the governor consists in substance of a summary of the commissions and instructions somewhat mechanically united with a series of sketches of administrations. The grouping of topics in chapters has been such as to produce an unnecessary amount of duplication. This is illustrated by the three accounts (pp. 157-159, 210-214, 241-245) of Governor Martin's controversy with the lower house about superior courts. The affair of the "regulators" is referred to in various places, but there is no one thoroughgoing discussion of it. In matters of detail also the book would have profited by thorough literary revision. There are a good many sentences which fail to give a clean-cut impression and there is some infelicitous use of words. Such an expression, for example, as "the said bill" seems out of place outside of a legal document.

The index does not seem to have been intelligently constructed. Its shortcomings may be illustrated by a single instance. Under the word Crown, without any subheads, about half the pages in the book are cited. Other heads similarly treated are Assembly and England. Notwithstanding its defects, which are largely those of the typical doctoral dissertation, the book was worth writing. It is the result of serious and for the most part accurate research and will be of real value to students of colonial history.

EVARTS B. GREENE.

*James Oglethorpe, the Founder of Georgia.* By HARRIET C. COOPER. [Historic Lives Series.] (New York: D. Appleton and Company. 1904. Pp. xii, 217.)

THIS little volume bears dedication "to the children of Georgia"; and is written, the preface states, "in the hope of familiarizing the youth

of the State" with Oglethorpe's "life, his achievements, and his character". Following the most available information, and chiefly Colonel C. C. Jones's excellent *History of Georgia*, Miss Cooper has succeeded in evolving a bright, entertaining, sympathetic, if rather breezily written volume, that ought to fulfill the purpose of its existence.

The title is somewhat misleading. The book is less a life of Oglethorpe than a history of the settlement of Georgia. Fewer than a score of pages are devoted to the eighty-five years of Oglethorpe's extra-colonial life, and nearly two hundred to the eleven years so heroically dedicated to the infant colony. This is not unnatural in view of the especial historic importance of his colonial experiences, and the difficulty of finding material for the other periods of his life; but one longs for the biographer who will make us familiar with the stirring days of campaigning under Eugene of Savoy — the formative period of Oglethorpe's soldierly character, and who will bring to light the interesting facts that must survive of a long life in England that was not without distinction.

Perhaps a certain latitude is permissible in a popular treatise addressed to youthful readers, but there is a general impression of carelessness of statement. Minor evidences of inaccuracy may be mentioned as noted at random: The date of Oglethorpe's birth is positively given, as if undisputed. One could rise from perusal of the volume without an inkling of the fact that the hero was possessed of a middle name. The too frequent blunder of American writers, "Lady Eleanor", is found for "Eleanor, Lady Oglethorpe". The South Carolinians, while coming in for their full share of blame in connection with the Spanish War, are given scant credit for their generous and really substantial assistance during the earlier days of the colony. It is stated (p. 22) that the colonists first landed at Savannah on the last day of January, 1732. The date of the first arrival of the founders of a new colony upon its soil is usually considered of some importance, and the state of Georgia has seen fit to commemorate this especial event by a public holiday, which is celebrated on February 12. The children of Georgia to whom the volume is dedicated may find here a puzzling discrepancy. As a matter of fact the author has fallen into a double error. Colonel Jones, who is evidently followed, says the colonists left Beaufort on January 30, were delayed overnight, and on the *next* day (meaning February 1) reached their destination. But Colonel Jones's chronology follows the old style, allowance for which will "give us our eleven days".

In the prevalent conception of Oglethorpe, his philanthropy and general mild benevolence are so emphasized as to overshadow the rest of his personality, and one is apt to think of him vaguely as otherwise rather insipid and something of a prig. To such an impression the pages of the author will prove a wholesome corrective. Miss Cooper by a happy selection of incidents brings into due prominence the various aspects of this striking character. We see him, full of fire and energy, the life and soul of the colony. When danger threatens from the Indians, his intrepidity is equal to a journey, almost alone, of two hundred miles into the

heart of their territory. His impressive bearing gives him complete ascendancy over the minds of the savage warriors. The still more formidable hostility of Spain he meets with a courage and generalship that prove the salvation of the colony.

The interesting facts of this period of Georgia's history are to a large extent inaccessible to the general reader. In presenting them in a convenient and readable form the author has rendered a distinct service.

J. H. T. McPHERSON.

*George Washington.* By NORMAN HAPGOOD. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1901. Pp. xi, 419.)

It is not difficult to explain why Washington should be such a favorite in biography, for the story of his career lends itself to picturesque development. The young surveyor and provincial soldier; the Virginia planter and burgess; the commander-in-chief of the Continental army; the center of the federal movement; and the first President — here is material suited to every taste. The difficulty in treating his life is found in the apparent contradiction between a rather commonplace man in characteristics and conditions which are royal in their splendid opportunities. It is not easy to reconcile the farmer counting every penny of expense with the man who bore the weight of the military operations of the Revolution, and the more delicate task of superintending the first years of a national administration which rested upon a compromise and was adopted by only a very small majority.

Mr. Hapgood has produced a book that meets the difficulties of the subject with success. He is no worshiper of the man, yet recognizes his many high qualities; nor is he depreciatory of the unheroic elements that cannot but make an impression upon all who study the private life of any great man. He holds an even balance and has written an orderly, judicious, and readable account of the leading phases of Washington's career. He is unsympathetic at times, and, as in the treatment of slaves, is inclined to be unfair to Washington. No one but a Virginian, or one steeped in the colonial history of Virginia, is able to enter into the plantation life of that great day. Costly and wasteful as it was under any conditions, it was peculiarly difficult to Washington, who knew well that there was a better system and one almost within his reach. His impatient efforts to improve his holdings out of the existing methods were hampered by the dead weight of slavery, and he pressed upon overseer and slave in the hope of obtaining better results. Nor is Mr. Hapgood just to John Adams, when describing the Conway Cabal. Adams had good reasons for his position, which never reached one of hostility to Washington. Mr. Hapgood also, it seems to me, trusts too implicitly the babbling Custis, for extracts are taken from his *Recollections* apparently with full confidence in their truth. As a fact Custis is a most uncertain guide except where he gives documentary proof of his stories. This readiness to accept the relation of others leads Mr. Hapgood to repeat the error

that Washington received the sword of Cornwallis in the surrender at Yorktown, even describing the horse on which he sat at the time. The letter of Franklin to Strahan is also taken seriously, although it has come to be looked upon as one of the philosopher's jokes. Was it Amherst who boasted at the outbreak of the Revolution that with five thousand English regulars he would engage to march from one end of the continent of North America to the other? It sounds more like the brag-gart Grant, to whom the saying is generally attributed. Washington is made to attend the Virginia convention on the Constitution — which he never entered; and Hamilton is held up to view for using, on a larger scale than it had ever reached before, the barter system in Congress to attain his ends, although the history of the Continental Congress from 1777 had been little else than such bargains. The deafness of Washington is said to have been "growing" on him in 1780, certainly too early a period for its appearance. A touch of journalism will account for the reference to a modern naval hero, and for the curious error of making Roger Wolcott Secretary of the Treasury.

Such slips of pen and memory do not affect the general tone of the book, which is wholesome and appreciative. "No figure in modern history compares with him as an influence toward public conscience." "Without great events Washington would not have been famous, and, on the other hand, he made events great by his ability in meeting them." "He made enemies in his life, but he left none at his death." The number of such sentences could be multiplied, and would only show how well Mr. Hapgood had read the character of Washington and measured its greatness as well as its weakness. There is no attempt to picture his family connection as unusual, or to represent his mother as a grand matron of heroic proportions. Mrs. Washington, his wife, is not raised above the mediocrity where she belongs, nor are superhuman gifts ascribed to her. Due credit is given to the men whom Washington called around him, and of whose abilities he had a fine discrimination. The story is told evenly and, as a whole, with good taste and judgment.

WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD.

*The Acquisition of Political, Social, and Industrial Rights of Man in America.* By JOHN BACH MCMASTER. (Cleveland: Cleveland Printing and Publishing Company. 1903. Pp. 123.)

THIS little volume of about 120 pages consists of three lectures delivered at Western Reserve University in the spring of 1903, under the auspices of the Western Reserve Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The author's purpose seems to be to trace the growth of the rights of man in American history from the Congress of 1774 down to the middle of the nineteenth century. The treatment from beginning to end is clear and concrete, because the various "rights of man" are traced in their historical settings, instead of being discussed in an abstract philosophical way.

The first lecture covers the period of the Revolution down to the ratification of the Constitution. The first important topic deals with the shifting of the basis of contention between the colonists and England from the rights of Englishmen to the rights of man, and the resulting Declaration of Independence. The author declares the ground taken by the colonists that they could not be taxed by Parliament "had been answered and fairly well refuted" (p. 12). He does not give the argument in refutation nor state by whom the answer was accepted. It was not accepted by the Whigs in America nor by the "Pitt Whigs" in England. It can be truly said that scores of moderate Tories in America preferred to rest their contention on the old ground rather than shift to the new. After enumerating the rights of man as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, it is refreshing to read:

It has become the custom in our time to decry these statements as glittering generalities. They are nothing of the kind. You may dissent from them, you may pronounce them totally wrong . . . yet these principles as laid down in the Declaration of Independence are just as truly principles of government by the people, as the divine right of kings was once the foundation of absolute monarchy (p. 14).

By comparing the bills of rights in the first state constitutions with the actual provisions of these constitutions, the author shows how wide was the gulf between the rights of man in theory and the rights of man in practice. He probably widens the Revolutionary conception of the natural rights of man when he extends it to include voting and holding office. The author is on safer ground in asserting that the Constitutional Convention of 1787 took a great step forward in turning over to the states the question of suffrage instead of tying it up by some Constitutional provision. The latter part of this lecture shows how far progress in industrial and social rights lagged behind the acquisition of political rights, and how the Revolution left untouched the social and industrial rights of the laborer, the poor, and the unfortunate. In justification of the seeming inconsistency of the Fathers, McMaster declares that they were in no sense disorganizers or anarchists, but that they waited for a chance to apply the rights of man decently and in order.

The second lecture is given over, in the main, to marking the progress of the new nation in a social and industrial way. The contest between the first political parties is looked upon as one between social and industrial classes. The rates of wages for different sections are given, and the effect of the western movement of population on the price of labor is noted. The author points out that such trades as were organized tried to force wages up by strikes, and appealed to the public for sympathy. The agitation against imprisonment for debt, the work of the humane societies in calling for the reform of prisons are traced, and the beginnings of the movement for manhood suffrage are touched in this lecture and completed in the third lecture. In addition, the author devotes considerable space in the third lecture to a new movement

for the rights of man as represented by Robert Dale Owen and his experiment in socialism at New Harmony, Indiana. Other kindred movements and the establishment of journals devoted to agitation in favor of this, that, or the other social or philanthropic movement are noted. The book closes with a discussion of the reform movement in Rhode Island, led by Dorr, which eventuated in a new constitution, forbidding slavery and extending the franchise.

The one wish the reviewer has in closing this little volume is that it could be placed in the hands of every grammar-school and high-school teacher of American history.

WM. H. MACE.

*Life of General Philip Schuyler, 1733-1804.* By BAYARD TUCKERMAN. (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company. 1903. Pp. v, 277.)

Mr. TUCKERMAN has succeeded in presenting the case of a much-wronged general in an impartial though not uninterested manner. The character of Philip Schuyler, hereditary and developed, is admirably drawn, and much space is devoted to his environment. The aristocratic landholder, who is at the same time pioneer on a rough frontier, is carefully and fully portrayed. The Hudson River manors are described, if not with the greatest accuracy of detail, at least with a force that leaves a clear impression upon the mind. The superficial aspects, the natural beauties of the region, the social life of the people, and the frontier dangers are treated rather than the more difficult subjects of their political and economic organization. Yet Philip Schuyler, and the social system of which he was a part, is set forth with no small literary talent. The limitations of the man and his ruling principles are so exposed that we can fully understand his conduct in the critical periods of his life.

After what appears to be an impartial examination of the Schuyler-Gates controversy, Mr. Tuckerman decides that the former's retirement was due to Gates's intrigues, in which the New England prejudice was artfully used. He comes to the conclusion (p. 231) that the retirement of Schuyler was an excusable error for Congress to make under the circumstances; but that the choice of his successor was a great mistake. In support of this view the author points out that Schuyler's military career had been characterized by care and good judgment but not by brilliancy; that his aristocratic manner, due to the environment in which he was born and bred, naturally irritated New-Englanders; that this dislike was intensified by Schuyler's connection with the dispute between New England and New York over the New Hampshire land grants; and finally that the necessary surrender of Ticonderoga, whose value was much overrated in New England, was quite sufficient to poison the minds of the Adamses, and other members from their section. Even the efforts of Schuyler in behalf of the health of his New England troops was misinterpreted, while his efforts to introduce discipline and subordination were



sullenly resisted. Schuyler lacked the patience and conciliatory manner which might have overcome this misunderstanding of him and his motives.

In the last chapter, a very brief and unsatisfactory treatment of Schuyler's political career, we find little that is new. Mr. Tuckerman effectually disposes of a slur which Bancroft cast upon Schuyler's estimate of Clinton as governor. The phrase, "His family and connections do not entitle him to so distinguished a predominance", is shown to have been taken out of its context and given a false prominence, if not a false meaning (pp. 251-252). Schuyler did not mean to infer that he had no other standard for public office than aristocratic position, but that he feared others might show disfavor for Clinton on that account. Excepting this defense, the chapter is weak because of lack of material. The intimate correspondence between Hamilton and Schuyler, which continued through the critical period of the making of the Constitution and the setting up of the new government, was destroyed by a son of one of Schuyler's executors. The intimate, unguarded views of Hamilton were in these letters, and with them must have perished much valuable information upon the history of the Federalist party.

The account of pre-Revolutionary politics in New York (pp. 75-82) contains a number of inaccurate statements of a character which suggest that the story is based upon certain general works written before the admirable monographic treatment recently given that period by Carl Becker. In general the setting for the activities of the hero is of less value than the matter concerning Schuyler himself. The author has studied Schuyler more deeply than the history of the times in which he lived.

As a piece of literature the book is a success. It is soberly but forcefully written, and the proportions are good. The military side of Schuyler's career is properly emphasized because it was in war and not in politics that he attained prominence. Only our interest in the events in which Schuyler had a part makes us desire a fuller treatment of his political activities, not because he attained such prominence that his own part in the events deserves especial attention.

The almost curt preface informs us that the memoir is based upon General Schuyler's papers and letter-books, on the Gates papers belonging to the New York Historical Society, and on the archives of the State Department in Washington. There is internal evidence of the use of these three sources, but the added clause "and on some other collections of original historical material" seems a needless mystery to plague us throughout 272 pages which are nowhere marred by ugly references. A reviewer is given the uncanny feeling that hidden pitfalls are always before him, and that all statements not otherwise supported may be buttressed by these unknown archives, which perhaps contain proofs that controvert old and established opinions or even facts. Reviewing becomes positively hazardous under such conditions. The index is poor. The volume is very attractive both as to the printing and binding.

C. H. VAN TYNE.



*The Life and Times of Thomas Smith (1745-1809).* By BURTON ALVA KONKLE. (Philadelphia: Campion and Company. 1904. Pp. xi, 303.)

ALTHOUGH the period covered by this biography was one of the most important and stirring in the political and constitutional history of Pennsylvania, it is only within recent years that it has attracted the especial attention of historical students. The most recent of these studies, the work under consideration, true to its title presents not only an excellent biography of Thomas Smith, but also a careful survey of the political and judicial history of Pennsylvania during his times.

Thomas Smith was born in Scotland, as were several of the friends and judicial associates of his adopted land, notably James Wilson, and Judges Brackenridge and Addison of the state bench. He was a half-brother of William Smith, the distinguished first provost of the University of Pennsylvania, then called the College of Philadelphia. In his appreciative introduction to this volume, Hampton L. Carson truly says, "The brothers became in a very real sense, though working in different fields, builders of the Commonwealth". Provost Smith, while Thomas was still but a lad in Scotland, had become famous on both sides of the Atlantic not only by reason of his educational position, but also through his political pamphlets, written during the French and Indian War, condemning the rule of the Quakers and their failure to provide for the defense of the province. The younger brother came to Pennsylvania in 1768, and, apparently through the good offices of his influential brother, he was soon appointed a deputy surveyor for a district west of the Susquehanna. For five years he continued surveying for the government, meanwhile studying law and being admitted to practice. He very soon "absorbed a large part of the government of Bedford county", holding at one time the office of prothonotary, clerk, recorder, and deputy register, as well as being a member of the bench of judges of this county.

With the coming on of the Revolution, Smith took an active part on the side of the patriots, holding various military and political offices. He was a colonel of militia, and deputy quartermaster-general, and successively a member of the provincial assembly, of the convention that formed the new state constitution, of the State Assembly (1776-1779), and of the Continental Congress (1780-1782). Then for nine years he practiced his profession and became a leading land lawyer, attending more courts than any other lawyer in his state, traveling on horseback upwards of three thousand miles annually. In 1791 he was appointed president judge of one of the district courts, and three years later was promoted to the supreme court, a position which he held until his death in 1809. Smith established the reputation of possessing "a larger and more accurate knowledge of land law than any of his associates".

The chapters covering the years of Smith's political career are the most interesting, as Mr. Konkle presents various phases of the prolonged contest between the friends and the opponents of the Constitution of 1776,

Smith being numbered among the latter. The strife between parties became so intense that politics entered into all the affairs of the day. Of the various contemporaries of Smith appearing in these pages — many of whom were of national fame — perhaps the most remarkable character was George Bryan, one of his political opponents, whose career is most sympathetically presented. As the leader of the radical popular party, he was the real author and steadfast defender of the Constitution of 1776, and largely directed the government under it. He was the first vice-president of the state, and later as chairman of twenty-seven out of thirty-nine committees of the assembly he presented a most remarkable instance of one-man power, more openly exhibited than is the custom of the modern political "boss". Bryan's chief claim for remembrance is due to his authorship of the emancipation law of 1780. Shortly after its enactment he was unanimously elected to the supreme court, where he remained for life. He did not, however, altogether give up his activity in politics, and is credited with being the author of the letters against the Constitution signed by "Centinel".

In addition to the discussion of the political history of the period, the work contains a valuable study of the origin and development of the state judiciary, and presents a very realistic picture of Pennsylvania of a century and more ago, through its descriptions of the life both on the frontier and in the city, and by its characterization of the leading public men. These are based chiefly upon contemporary accounts. The work is a decided contribution to the history of the period. It might well have included a fuller account of the political contests over the College and the Bank, and of the work of the Council of Censors, as well as the struggle over the adoption of the Federal Constitution. These subjects, however, have been in part covered by other writers, and were not intimately connected with the career of Thomas Smith. The only error noted is the statement on page 191 that Congress was sitting at Annapolis in 1787.

The volume is handsomely printed and is embellished with over forty illustrations comprising a notable series of maps, portraits, and views.

HERMAN V. AMES.

*Napoleon. A History of the Art of War, from the Beginning of the French Revolution to the End of the Eighteenth Century, with a Detailed Account of the Wars of the French Revolution.* In four volumes. Volumes I and II. By Lieutenant-Colonel THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE, U. S. A. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company. 1904. Pp. xx, 620; ix, 562.)

It was only eleven years ago that Lévy declared in his *Napoleon intime* that the true history of Napoleon had yet to be written, but in that time immense strides have been made in the right direction. Professor Sloane's *Life of Napoleon Bonaparte* supplied, among many other details,

abundant valuable information which no one else had been able to unearth respecting the early life of the great Corsican; and as a result of his work it was possible for the first time to understand logically the development of the gaunt, poverty-stricken, but nevertheless proud and masterful little Corsican of the Military School of Brienne, through the various stages which made him the foremost general and the most dazzling character in the history of the world. The closing days of the "eagle Emperor" chained to a lonely rock in the Atlantic "a thousand miles from anywhere" have been discussed anew by Lord Rosebery in his incisive volume on *Napoleon, the Last Phase*, and the manifold conflicting events and works dealing with this period have been weighed like legal evidence and definitely placed in the categories where they properly belong. For more than eighty years an immense amount of invaluable information lay in the archives of the British Foreign Office, untouched except by Fyffe's *History of Modern Europe*, and it remained for John Holland Rose to bring to light in his *Life of Napoleon I* a great deal of new material which had not previously been published in any such admirable form. Another work of much merit was Dr. A. Fournier's *Napoleon I*, which first appeared in German, then in French in 1892, and has now been translated into English.

Although these general works possess an immense deal of valuable information, they obviously cannot grapple with all the phases of a life the like of which never has been, and unquestionably never will be, seen again. Such a task, as Rosebery points out, is far too stupendous for any one man to accomplish and the desideratum can never be attained until all the manifold sides of that remarkable figure have been dissected and analyzed by specialists. Although the general reader cannot be gainsaid his undeniable right to demand works having approximate completeness in their treatment of important historical personages, yet this does not diminish the value of the labors of specialists who can alone, each man in his own line, ultimately furnish a complete history of the "little man in the great gray coat", whose colossal genius towers far above that of any other historical character and who for years controlled the destinies of Europe.

There still remains a vast amount of material relating to his military career as yet untouched, but each year brings more of these treasures to light. The movement in this direction was unquestionably initiated by General Baron Jomini, one of the greatest of military writers, whose *Life of Napoleon*, published first in French and translated into English in 1864, is still the model for works of this kind, just as Captain P. Foucart's *Campagne de Prusse*, published in 1887 and 1890, is a model for those who confine themselves to one campaign and who, by going directly to the original sources, follow the "Oxford system", inaugurated by Lecky, which is the best method by which accurate historical data is brought to light. A less technical but nevertheless specialized work of inestimable value is the admirable work *Napoleon as a General* from the pen of that brilliant colonel, Count Yorck von Wartenburg of

the Prussian General Staff, whose untimely death in China is a cause of genuine regret. These two volumes, based on the *Correspondance* published by order of Napoleon III, were first brought out in German and only two years ago appeared in print in English as part of "The Wolseley Series". Two other works deserving of highest rank are the masterful comments on the Italian campaigns of 1796-1797 and 1800 contained in H. H. Sargent's *Napoleon Bonaparte's First Campaign* and *The Campaign of Marengo*. Unremitting researches by continental writers are yearly producing innumerable memoirs, correspondence, and technical works dealing with the multiplicity of details which went to make the Napoleonic era the most remarkable military epoch in history, and the side-lights thus thrown on the central dominating figure have done much to bring out many points which have hitherto remained in the dark.

One would think that all the numberless works treating of this colossus in his various aspects as strategist, statesman, lawgiver, and man had well-nigh exhausted the subject but, although more has been written of this one individual than of any other historical personage, many times over, the fund of knowledge pertaining to him seems like an eternal spring, many of whose sources are still unfathomed. Historical treasures, like the most precious jewels, are generally unearthed in a form too crude for use and need to be subjected to some refining process which gives them their value. Hence it is that the labor of the excavator is incomplete until supplemented by that of the refiner, to whom the world is principally indebted for its most valuable acquisitions. In this latter category we now have the pleasure of chronicling one of the most notable contributions to the military history of the greatest of all strategists which has appeared in the last decade — the first two volumes of Colonel Dodge's *Napoleon*. There are few men living better qualified than he to undertake such a difficult work; a soldier who has participated in many of the campaigns of the Civil War, a keen observer who for several years lived in and breathed the atmosphere of a martial capital like Berlin, a writer of unusual depth of research and breadth of view, as shown by his previous works on the campaigns of "Great Captains", he exemplifies admirably the maxim given by Napoleon — which he quotes at the beginning of his first volume — who declared that in order to master the secret of the art of war one must read and re-read the history of the eighty-eight campaigns of great commanders like Alexander, Hannibal, Caesar, Gustavus Adolphus, and Frederick, and by modeling oneself on them learn to reject maxims opposed to theirs. Colonel Dodge has already published works on all of these captains — except Frederick the Great, which has wisely been deferred pending the appearance of the exhaustive treatise being prepared by the German General Staff — and the years of study which he has spent in the preparation of these works is manifest on almost every page of his *Napoleon*. Only those who had labored in the way which he has done would be able to compare how General Bonaparte advancing on Turin in 1796 remembered the difficulty which Prince Eugene had had in 1706; the similarity between the

fighting on the causeways at Arcole and of Cæsar at Alexandria, of Castiglione and Leuthen, of the battles of Mount Tabor and the Pyramids and those of Alexander; or to show how Napoleon's crossing of the Little St. Bernard in 1800 was "a mere summer day's excursion" (II, 27) compared with Hannibal's traversing the same pass or Alexander's crossing of the Hindu-Kush; and how Napoleon's letter of October 12, 1806, to his "Brother" of Prussia was "a stratagem worthy of Hannibal, father of stratagems" (II, 375).

Dodge's *Napoleon*, like the other books of his "Great Captains" series, is founded on the postulate that "the great captain is the product of exceptional intellect, exceptional force of character and exceptional opportunity", supplemented by the fact that "the highest strategy is generally the product of the greatest brain". The reviewer was the first writer in English to summarize the five principal characteristics of Napoleonic strategy, *viz.*: (1) the initiative at the beginning of hostilities, (2) one line of operations, (3) the unity of forces, (4) the rapidity of movement on decisive points, and (5) the invariable concentration for battle, illustrated by maxims culled from Napoleon's own writings, and to point out that "throughout these above-enumerated principles runs the fundamental idea of simplicity" (*Journal of the Military Service Institution*, XXVIII, 20, January, 1901). These ideas have been admirably enlarged by Colonel Dodge, who in chapter XXI (II, 11-12) which deals with the events immediately following the establishment of the Consulate and preceding the campaign of Marengo, aptly says:

The conception of all Napoleon's campaigns and the simple perfection of their opening is a study. Several points are always prominent. The army has but one line of operations. Along this line the mass is to be projected. The objective is to be the enemy's army. The line chosen is one running around the flank of the enemy, upon his communications. If possible this flank is to be the strategic flank, that is, the one which most surely cuts the enemy off from his own base. And last, while thus threatening the enemy's, the line is to be such as to conserve one's own communications. These were principles on which this great soldier always acted. In other words, his rule for opening a campaign was this: move in one mass upon the enemy's army, along one line of operations, from such a base and in such a direction that you shall turn his strategic flank and threaten his communications, without prejudicing your own. Then if you beat him in the battle it should be your aim at once to bring on, you can destroy him. This theory, put into words, sounds simple; but it has taken twenty-four centuries of war to enable any one to enunciate the rule; and Napoleon has been the one great captain who consistently practiced it.

Colonel Dodge's work abounds in such admirable summaries as the above, which show in what good stead his previous studies have stood him and how thoroughly he has weighed every authority and every detail. The work opens with an exhaustive examination of the condition and organization of the military establishments of France, Prussia, and Austria, followed by a careful consideration of tactics and administration

at the end of the eighteenth century. No detail has been neglected; the organization of the various arms, minor and battle tactics, administration and supply, baggage, discipline, fortifications and field-works, rations and pay are treated in a manner which has no counterpart in English military literature. All these important minutiae are known to the student who has delved into the valuable technical works of other languages, and Colonel Dodge has conferred a genuine benefit in placing such valuable facts within the reach of English-speaking readers.

Beginning with an army "rotten in its organization, discipline and morale" and "as bad as the worst of the mercenaries of the Thirty Years' War", Dodge shows how the French, actuated by the subversive creeds of the Revolution, succeeded in holding head against the entire Continent in spite of the internal dissensions, the constant guillotining of incompetent commanders, and the radical faults of the system inaugurated by Carnot, who, though mediocre himself as a general, proved to be the "organizer of Victory". Although the lessons taught by Frederick the Great were almost entirely forgotten and the faulty dissemination of forces due to adherence to the "cordon system", the French nevertheless profited by the experience of the officers who had served in the American Revolution, consisting, as Dodge points out, of "the superiority of good marksmen in open order, each one taking advantage of the accidents of the ground, over seasoned regulars who fought elbow to elbow" (I, 24). Frederick the Great's disciple in France was Guibert, whose school won the day against the advocates of the deep formation, with the result that on August 1, 1791, the "Ordinance", which remained in technical force through the Napoleonic era, inaugurated a new method known as "skirmishers in great bands", which fostered "that forward swing whose normal effect so often leads to victory, and which was so thoroughly consistent with the French character" (II, 180). The result was that

The new French cry was "Audacity, more audacity, always audacity!" The French armies forded great rivers in the teeth of the enemy; they crossed vast mountain ranges with cavalry and artillery; they threw bridges under heavy artillery fire; they bivouacked without tents; they marched and fought without magazines; they waded through rivers breast-high; they made continuous marches in snow ankle-deep.

The "theory of the impossible" became a doctrine and brought into existence a military fervor and a nascent moral force which needed only the guiding hand of a master-spirit to be developed into irresistible power. The hour was ripe for the "man of Destiny".

Through the campaigns of 1796, 1797, Egypt, Marengo, the Ulm manœuvres which are among "the very finest in history", Austerlitz, "the first pattern of a great battle he had shown the world", Jena, and its masterful pursuit, in which the Prussians "lost all save honor", Pultusk, whose lesson should have prevented the disastrous events of 1812, Eylau, "the bloodiest battle since Malplaquet", Heilsberg, which gave evidence of Napoleon's belief in his seeming invincibility, and



Friedland, where he caught the Russians in a faulty position and practically destroyed them, Dodge traces the working of the great strategist in all its details. He contrasts his *modus operandi* with that of the other French generals who were governed by Carnot's plan of attacking two wings at one and the same time, and the allied generals who—with the one exception of Suwarrov who "had the soul of a great captain, but not the head", as Napoleon said—were wedded to the "cordon system" or hampered by the "blundering interference" of the Aulic Council, a "hide-bound", "hypercritical, antiquated", but "distinguished body of fossils" "to which from the days of Prince Eugene Austria had owed all her reverses". Furthermore Dodge demonstrates that even a Napoleon could not violate the fundamental laws of war without suffering the inevitable consequences, as he did at Marengo and in 1807, when he disseminated his forces and permitted Bennigsen temporarily to wrest from him the initiative and the control of "interior lines".

While Dodge contributes no material which has not already seen print and while he closely follows Jomini and Yorck von Wartenburg, he has nevertheless concentrated in admirable form the information previously scattered in hundreds of volumes, and his work bids fair to be the best military history of Napoleon in English. Unlike previous writers who have been possessed of the idea that men in war are mere automata, Dodge is wise not to neglect the "personal equation", and he has successfully endeavored to give a brief but complete picture of a Napoleonic army in all its details, taking care to show how they were fed and how the transport was furnished by the Breidt Company—facts of which most English readers know nothing. His summaries of political events are succinct and comprehensive, his descriptions of the various terrains—nearly all of which he has visited in person—are admirable, and his examination of the reasons which induced the First Consul in 1800 to give the principal strategical theater in Suabia to Moreau while he took the subordinate theater in Italy, his chapter on the "Formation for Battle", and his account of the causes which made the Gaul superior to the Teuton in the opening of the campaign of Jena, are the work of a master hand. He judiciously avoids many of the pitfalls abounding in this period by declining to be drawn into such fruitless discussions as whether Bonaparte was justified in administering poison to some of his plague-stricken men after Acre, whether he really intended to invade England, and whether the Third Coalition was originated by Russia or by England. His style is generally terse and direct, in all the mass of detail the principal point is never lost sight of, and the method of presentation is clear and convincing. The two volumes are profusely illustrated, but the portraits and cuts of uniforms, while interesting and usually well chosen—one of the best being those of the "guns of the period"—are seldom identified as to source or authenticity. Although Dodge emphasizes the fact that it was his strategy rather than his tactics which underlay Napoleon's successes, yet it seems to me that more detail would have been in keeping with a work professedly technical than is to



*Mathiez: La Théophilanthropie et le Culte Décadaire* 189

be found in the skeleton maps, stripped of all but the bald essentials, which illustrate the operations described; and it is lamentable that more care should not have been taken in making the spelling of names on the maps agree with the spelling in the text — the most flagrant case being the map of the Mantua-Leoben country, in which no less than eighteen names differ from the orthography of the text. An error has also been made in saying that Marmont was created a marshal in 1804 and as such commanded one of the corps of the Grand Army in the Ulm-Austerlitz campaign, whereas he did not really obtain his baton until after Wagram.

Colonel Dodge has not sufficiently accentuated the three periods into which Wartenburg has divided Napoleon's career as a general, and it seems to me that he follows too closely the *Mémoires de Sainte-Hélène* which, although among the most remarkable writings in history, are not always to be relied upon unless thoroughly verified by more authoritative material; Thiers's brilliant work errs for the same reason in that he followed too closely the *Bulletins*, which, as Napoleon wrote to Masséna on October 11, 1805, were "drawn up in haste and on the run". However it is asking too much to demand an absolutely accurate history until all the treasures of the war archives of the continent have been unearthed and treated in the manner of Foucart's *Campagne de Prusse*. Dodge has done a notable work, and the close of his second volume has left us at Tilsit, where the emperor's star shone its brightest. We shall anticipate with pleasure the remaining volumes, especially to see how he will treat of Eckmühl — where the maneuvers surpassed even those of Ulm — and of the campaign of France — where the titanic struggle again called forth the mightiest efforts of the genius who taught the world more of the art of war than any other captain of ancient or modern times.

FREDERIC L. HUIDEKOPER.

*La Théophilanthropie et le Culte Décadaire, 1796-1801: Essai sur l'Histoire Religieuse de la Révolution.* Par ALBERT MATHIEZ. [Bibliothèque de la Fondation Thiers, IV.] (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1904. Pp. 753.)

THIS volume and its companion, *Les Origines des Cultes Révolutionnaires, 1789-1792* (Paris, Société Nouvelle de Librairie et d'Édition, 1904), are the two theses presented by M. Mathiez, at the University of Paris for his doctorate. M. Mathiez, who was formerly a student at the École Normale Supérieure and later a student pensioner on the Thiers Foundation, is at present professor *agrégé* of history in the Lycée at Caen. He has for some time been a frequent contributor to historical reviews and an active member in French historical societies, and is one of the most brilliant of the younger generation of French historians. This volume recommends itself at first glance by the dedication to MM. Aulard and Bourgeois, the two eminent masters under whose friendly guidance M. Mathiez has pursued diligently the study of every phase of the religious history of the Revolution. These two theses and

various review articles are the first fruit of these extensive researches in a field which has hitherto been left too fully to the martyrologist. The excellence and completeness of these first essays, which treat of single episodes, will commend to a kindly consideration any future work of the author upon his chosen subject. The thorough documentation of the volumes is a guaranty of the exacting research and the patient accuracy of the author. The systematic arrangement of the book and the full index, so sadly wanting in too many French books, will especially commend this volume to every student who may use it.

While all will agree in testifying to the author's scholarship, many will differ with him in their attitude toward the subject. M. Mathiez, like his masters, is a convinced supporter of the Third Republic and takes a keen interest in its policies, especially those affecting the church and education, which are of such vast importance at this moment. He has studied the religious problem during the French Revolution as a part of the problem which confronts the France of to-day. To the American, happily long since accustomed to the separation of church and state and to their coexistence, anti-clericalism is something he cannot understand, especially when it extends to a complete rejection of Christianity or any possible revealed religion (p. 705). To the Frenchman of to-day the Revolution is, in the phrase of M. Clemenceau, a "bloc" which he must accept or reject as a whole. To him the questions which perplex the Third Republic are the same as those which troubled the First Republic, and the greatest of these is the religious and educational question, for not only have church and state been linked together in France but education and religion have seemed inseparable. Naturally the intimate relations of church and state, of royalty and clergy, under the *ancien régime* caused the revolutionists to hold the church jointly responsible with the old monarchy for all of the existing evils. The Revolution sought at first to subordinate the church to the state, but the ultramontanism of the clergy soon developed official indifference and even official persecution of the church. The revolutionist hated the church because of the enormous financial burdens, direct or indirect, which it had imposed; he distrusted it because it owed allegiance and demanded obedience to a foreign ruler whose interests were by no means consonant with the national welfare of France; he hated the presence of a privileged class, the clergy, which was the ever-present symbol of that obnoxious allegiance which it sought ever to make more exacting. In short, the financial, political, and moral power of the clergy seemed to be used for purposes hostile to the interests of both the people and the nation. It is little wonder that the religion professed by this clergy fell under the same condemnation as the clergy themselves. The Revolution taught men that some of the duties formerly entrusted to the church could be performed better, less expensively, and less dangerously by the state. Men then began to dream of replacing the discredited church by a new religion, pure, undefiled, and, above all, patriotic. The Revolution had destroyed and satisfactorily replaced the monarchy, why could

it not destroy and replace the church? The Church believed that its safety required the overthrow of the Republic and the undoing of the Revolution. The Revolution and its child, the Republic, were equally convinced that safety could be obtained only by destroying the power of the Church, if not the Church itself.

Just as Jeroboam realized that the people of Israel could not long be loyal to his kingdom if they continued to go Jerusalem, a foreign capital, to worship, so the revolutionists felt that the Republic was insecure as long as its citizens owed allegiance to a foreign pontiff; and like Jeroboam the revolutionists essayed to create a new, a national patriotic religion. The worship of reason, the worship of the Supreme Being, and the system of revolutionary festivals each abode their destined hour and went their way, while others were still-born. The *Culte Décadaire* was a purely political religion and fostered by Merlin of Douai and his fellow-directors from October, 1798, to July, 1800. It was in a measure a revival of the old system of Revolutionary festivals established in connection with the Revolutionary calendar during the Terror. Theophilanthropy was the longest-lived of these transient religions. It was invented by Chemin, a Parisian bookseller and freemason, and by Valentin Haüy, the famous friend and benefactor of the blind, in the winter of 1796-1797. Under the patronage of the director Larevellière-Lépeaux it secured official recognition. Its vogue was chiefly in Paris and in a few cities of the provinces, but it had ramifications in foreign countries, not excepting the United States, where the French of Gallipolis in Ohio and Thomas Paine each showed an active interest in it. It fell under the ban of the law in October, 1801. Thanks to MM. Aulard and Mathiez, we now possess satisfactory accounts of the different attempts of the Revolution to create a religion.

GEORGE M. DUTCHER.

*The Life of Nathaniel Macon.* By WILLIAM E. DODD, Ph.D. (Raleigh, N. C.: Edwards and Broughton. 1903. Pp. xvi, 443.)

PROFESSOR DODD'S book is a welcome contribution to American political biography. As he tells us in the preface, it is the first comprehensive life of Macon yet attempted. While this famous North Carolinian is not accounted a great statesman, still his long public career during the formative period of our nation, his thirty-seven years of conspicuous service in Congress, his position as favorite representative of North Carolina, his relation to the secessionist school and to the great sectional struggle, his independence, and his Randolph democracy render his biography a work of much more than local or passing interest.

Professor Dodd has dealt with the subject very acceptably. The style, marred only by an occasional sentence that is loose, awkward, or obscure, is prevailingly clear, careful, and engaging. The material is drawn in part from published sources, but quite largely from manuscript letters and records. These sources, scattered and on many points scanty,

seem to have been used judiciously and to good advantage. In scope the book is more than a mere chronicle of events in Macon's life; it embraces as a background for its peculiar subject not a little of national history from the Revolution to the accession of Jackson, and more especially of North Carolina history as related to national affairs and to Macon's career. The author's attitude is temperate and scholarly, but sympathetic. He emphasizes, as cardinal points in Macon's political character, his integrity, his insistence upon economy, his ardent local patriotism, and his belief in democracy. He finds Macon's best expression of political faith in his declaration that "In proportion as men live easily and comfortably, in proportion as they are free from the burdens of taxation, they will be attached to the government in which they live" (p. 288). Macon's speech on the repeal of the Judiciary Act, printed in an appendix, is pronounced "the longest and most characteristic speech of his congressional career" (p. 404). Professor Dodd's general estimate of Macon is indicated by the following sentences from his concluding pages: "His place in history must be determined by his relations to the South as a distinct section of the nation. He believed . . . that next to the State the South had the first demands on his service . . . Macon must be regarded as Randolph's counterpart in founding the creed of the secessionists; he was a stronger and more influential man than 'his brilliant but flighty friend of Roanoke' . . . He was a Southern statesman in the sectional sense . . . *He actually believed in democracy*" (pp. 400-401).

In conclusion some matters of detail call for a word of comment. For instance, the Missouri Compromise line is given as "36 degrees 40 seconds" (p. 318). We read that "Importation of foreign slaves into the United States had been prohibited by the Constitution after January 1, 1808" (p. 212). We may question whether Monroe was "an exceedingly wise and able President" (p. 299) and Van Buren "the ablest of our public men of the second order" (p. 391). Still more may we dissent from the opinion that the slavery struggle culminating in the Civil War was merely a matter of dollars and to be explained on economic grounds alone (pp. 103, 213). Certainly it is a little surprising that Macon's speech upon the proposed government for newly-purchased Louisiana is not mentioned, while his opinions and utterances upon matters of much less present-day or permanent interest are given due attention.

PAUL S. PEIRCE.

*The Lower South in American History.* By WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1902. Pp. xi, 271.)

THIS volume is made up of eight papers. The substance of the first three was given as "public lectures at Harvard University and at various Southern colleges". The next three were published originally in *The Atlantic Monthly*, and only the last two appear for the first time. The

first three papers give title to the volume. Here the author concisely analyzes the conditions that he conceives made it possible for the lower South to exercise a controlling influence in national affairs from "the admission of Missouri in 1820 to the secession of South Carolina". He contrasts Alabama as typical of the lower south, with Virginia as representing the upper, and succinctly points out the social, religious, and industrial differences between them.

There were few if any racial differences, as the immigrants to the newer country came mainly from "the older seaboard Southern states". More than half of the population was made up of planters and farmers. Their industrial life differed from that in Virginia "chiefly in the concentration of land and slaves in fewer hands, in the greater immediate profitableness of agriculture, and in the greater rapidity with which lands were exhausted". Three-fourths of the 335,000 slaves in the state were owned "by less than ten thousand men". In "manufactures, banking, commerce, and all other industries" not more than 100,000 persons were engaged.

There was an intense religious life. The "richer planters and their associates" accepted the Episcopalian form of worship. The Baptists and Methodists were strong everywhere. In 1850 there were nearly fifteen hundred houses of worship. Popular education however languished. There was no organized public-school system until late in the fifties, and the percentage of illiterates was large. The best intellect of the state went into medicine or the ministry, "but oftener into the law, and through the law into politics". When Monroe retired from the Presidency in 1825, and the ascendancy of Virginia in national affairs came to an end, the influence Virginia had wielded was taken up and continued by the "Black Belt".

The author's analysis is interesting, but he probably claims too much for the lower South in controlling national action on the questions of tariff, internal improvements, and finance. And on the question of the annexation of Texas and the Mexican War his position is not wholly tenable. He says:

Slavery had to do with the seizure of Texas and the attempts upon Cuba. But we may not attribute to that alone this single act in the long drama which began before the first slave landed in Virginia and ended in 1898. The true cause of it was that old land hunger which half the world has not satisfied. . . . When the last act came on, and Mexico had to be conquered, it was mainly volunteers from the Cotton states, joined by a few of their Northern friends, like Franklin Pierce, who swelled our little army to the strength the enterprise demanded (pp. 77-78).

No doubt both causes played a part. It hardly can be gainsaid, however, that the interests of slavery were the immediate and dominant motives. Slavery explains the land-hunger of that time. The acquisition of new territory for the erection of new slave states to maintain the South's equality in the Senate to bolster up slavery was the controlling motive.

Of the remaining papers, one is on William Lowndes Yancey, "the orator of secession". Another is on the resources of the Confederacy. This is based on Professor John C. Schwab's excellent work on the financial and industrial history of the south during the Civil War. The third is a concise account of the origin and organization of the Kuklux movement in the first years following the war. The fourth, "A New Hero of an Old Type", is a rhetorical eulogy on Lieutenant Richard Hobson. The fifth and last is entitled "Shifting the White Man's Burden". In this paper the author considers the disfranchise movement in the south, but finds no solution of the problem. Mr. Brown has written an interesting and suggestive book. His treatment is fair; his statement is clear though at times he is somewhat too rhetorical. The book is not a history, but is an excellent beginning toward one. It makes little if any contribution of fact, and its chief value is in its suggestiveness.

JOHN WILLIAM PERRIN.

*The Republican Party: A History of its Fifty Years' Existence and a Record of its Measures and Leaders, 1854-1904.* By FRANCIS CURTIS. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1904. Two vols., pp. xxi, 532; v, 566.)

THESE volumes are written by a candid party advocate. The author, obviously, has believed in the Republican party in the past, believes in it to-day, and bids fair to continue to believe in it in time to come. The volumes contain a "Foreword" by President Roosevelt and "Introductions" by Hon. William P. Frye, President *pro tempore* of the Senate, and Hon. J. G. Cannon, Speaker of the House of Representatives. The work may be regarded, therefore, as a party history officially recognized. Though not impartial, the work may be said to be useful and fair, as it accomplishes very well its aim of setting forth fully and clearly, though without attempt at philosophical exposition, what the Republican party has accomplished during the fifty years of its history. The author does this with a good sense of proportion and selection. Whatever one may think of Republican policies, the life of one of our great parties will be recognized as a theme worthy of the party historian; and as a record of party creed and achievement Mr. Curtis's work is worthy of commendation and appreciation.

The author opens his work with the birth of the Republican party under the oaks at Jackson, the fiftieth anniversary of which event has recently been fittingly celebrated; yet half his first volume is taken up with a preliminary review of the great slavery controversy that brought the Republican party into being. The author goes at considerable length into the formative and heroic period of the Republican party, when it contended against the extension of slavery, when it required nerve, the severance of party ties, and the sacrifice of personal reputations and interests to stand for the cause; and he very properly gives large space to the complex party situation of 1854 and 1856. Scant attention is



given to the Liberty party in 1844, but partial recognition is made (due to Senator Hoar's example and mugwumpery of that day) of the Free-soil platform of 1848 as the forerunner of the Republican position of 1856. The Know-nothing movement is fully treated, and the beginnings of the Republican party in 1854, by spontaneous movements and meetings in various states in the north in opposition to the Kansas-Nebraska bill, are traced in considerable detail. To the special student of party history in America the material brought together from articles, letters, speeches, and reminiscences in this part of Mr. Curtis's work relating to the credit due for the origins of his party are of much interest and value.

Mr. Curtis denies the right of the present Democratic party to claim its ancestry in Jefferson. The founder of the Democratic party is referred to as an "ardent protectionist", and no distinction is made between the Anti-Federal party that opposed the adoption of the Constitution and the Democratic-Republican party of Jefferson that had its birth in a conflict over questions of Constitutional construction. The hyphenated word "Democratic-Republican" Mr. Curtis discards altogether, holding that the party of Jefferson was merely "Republican", as by that name alone Jefferson always sought to call his party. Jefferson's desire no doubt prevailed after his party came into unquestioned power and reputation, and it might be just as well to do as Mr. Curtis does, apply the single name "Republican" to the old party of Jefferson, if it were possible to change historical terminology. But the effort must be regarded as quite vain wherein the author seeks to make the Republican party of Jefferson the forebears, not of the modern Democratic party, but of the Whigs, and, therefore, by implication, of the modern Republicans. "The old Republican party, as such," he says, "was merged almost wholly into the Whig party"; "the campaign of 1828 can well be said to be a conflict between Republicans and Democrats"; "The name National Republican was retained until the campaign of 1832, when the party became known as the Anti-Mason party, afterwards the Whigs." Subsequently in speaking of the Antimasonic party the author says, with an apparent inconsistency, "The old Federalists were very glad of the opportunity to get together in a new organization, and eagerly welcomed the advent of the anti-Masonic party" (I, 80). The modern Democratic party, he thinks, finds its origin under Jackson in 1828, "now, for the first time, triumphant", and it was composed "largely of the inhabitants of the slaveholding States". All this is confusing, if not misleading, and it throws no light on the conflicting claims of the Jacksonian Democrats and the Clay Whigs to be the linear descendants of the Jeffersonian Republicans. A historical argument may be made for either view, but the burden of the argument is in favor of the Democrats, though evidently Mr. Curtis does not consider it his office to vindicate the claim of the opposing client.

The bulk of Mr. Curtis's volumes is very properly occupied with giving, in historical order, the record of the issues, platforms, and con-



tests with which the country has had to do since 1856. Here may be found, in large measure, the political history of the last fifty years. Special interest attaches to the conventions and campaigns of 1860, 1864, 1880, and 1884. Light notice is taken, very naturally, of the shortcomings of the party, either of the last generation or of this. But in the record of the party conventions many interesting nominating speeches and party discussions are given, and the proceedings and decisions are set forth by which the evolution of the unwritten party law is revealed. Some readers will be disappointed and surprised that more attention is not given to the development of party machinery and to the importance of party organization, practice, and usage in popular government; for on this line we find one of the most striking characteristics of our party life during the lifetime of the Republican party. The most recent events and issues in our party history are discussed from the Republican point of view, and the volumes may be regarded as a good and useful summary of Republican principles and policies, with the party defenses well and ably guarded.

In his closing chapter, on "Defections from the Party", which is largely a discussion of party ethics, Mr. Curtis makes a plea at length in favor of party fealty and against the spirit of the mugwump. Of the four historic Republican defections, the first, that of 1864, says Mr. Curtis, was "only a flash in the pan"; the second, that of 1872, was a failure that brought only ridicule to its cause and death to its candidate; the third, that of 1884, was based on a false charge, and he condemns its leader, Mr. George William Curtis, as "bound in honor to support the ticket and platform" (II, 472) which he helped to make; the fourth defection, that of the Silver Republicans in 1896, strengthened the party rather than weakened it. The mugwumps, the author declares, have in no way influenced party nominations or the course of party history; to the credit of electing Cleveland, if credit it be and if such credit can be claimed, the author allows the mugwumps to be entirely welcome. Considerable attention is given to Mr. George William Curtis and Mr. Carl Schurz as leaders of mugwump opinion, and severe criticism is meted out to the *Springfield Republican* as a typical mugwump journal, which is characterized as making "untruthful and unjust attacks . . . upon the nation's trusted officers" (II, 481).

The appendix of the work contains a good deal of good party material. Students and readers who are interested in American politics and party history will find cause of gratitude to Mr. Curtis for the result of his labor.

JAMES A. WOODBURN.

*The History of Twenty-five Years.* By Sir SPENCER WALPOLE, K.C.B. Volume I, 1856-1865; Volume II, 1865-1870. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1904. Two vols., pp. xviii, 529; xiv, 525.)

It is twenty years since Sir Spencer Walpole completed his six-

volume *History of England from 1815 to 1858*, a work to which the present history forms in some sort the sequel. But the author warns his reader that these later volumes aim at covering not merely the history of England but that of continental Europe and the United States between 1856 and 1881. And this gives them a peculiar interest and importance. They have no real competitor in English, for Fyffe's *Modern Europe* is constructed on a much smaller scale, and Mr. McCarthy's *History of Our Own Times* is both too exclusively British and too journalistic to compete either in scope or in style with Sir Spencer's work. The recently advertised history by Mr. Herbert Paul may intend to traverse the same ground, but anybody who is familiar with Mr. Paul's other books will hardly expect from him the large views, the judicial temper, the mellow and deliberate opinions, which make Sir Spencer a historian of unusual excellence.

Walpole's work consists practically of thirteen monographs, varying in length from sixty to one hundred pages, of which seven are directly concerned with British internal affairs, and one each with the union of Italy, with Poland and Denmark, with the American Civil War and the Mexican Empire, with the rise of Prussia, and with the collapse of the French Empire. It is particularly to those non-British chapters that attention should be called, because, so far as I am aware, there is nothing else in English so good, nothing that supplies their place. The account of the union of Italy, for instance, compresses into comparatively small compass diplomatic and political negotiations, many of which have only recently been revealed, which extended over seven years; and, what is more to the purpose, the treatment is as sympathetic as it is clear. So too the chapter on the American Civil War is written with a fine candor. Sir Spencer lays bare the truculence of Palmerston, the supercilious hostility of the British aristocracy toward the North, and the uncertain and often mistaken policy of the British Foreign Office; but he also shows the basis on which British prejudices rested, and the blunders, of which the seizure of Mason and Slidell was the greatest, in the American conduct. Throughout the work, indeed, he describes with scrupulous precision the state of mind which conditioned the acts of each of the parties to a dispute. As a specimen of his skill in disentangling the most snarly skein of modern diplomacy, the chapter on the Schleswig-Holstein affair may be recommended. Possibly, the portion of his history which some readers will concur in least is that which unfolds the rise of Prussia. Sir Spencer describes Bismarck's genius in all its strength, but with its utter ignoring of moral considerations when a political advantage was to be gained for Prussia.

The chapters devoted to Great Britain take up Parliamentary and party development, but they go much deeper than that, for Sir Spencer traces also the progress of inventions, the changes in social and religious ideals, and the altered views of man's relations to the universe which the teachings of Darwin and the evolutionists brought about. The great topics, such as the Reform Bill of 1867 or the Irish Question, are of

course given due attention; but you will find also very interesting accounts of the development of steamships, of the introduction of limited liability, of the construction of the Thames embankment and the metropolitan drainage system, and of the admission of Jews to Parliament. Special mention should be made of a general survey of civilization during the sixth decade of the nineteenth century, and of passages which summarize British conditions about 1860 in a manner recalling Macaulay's famous description of England under Charles II. But most stress should be laid, not upon the accuracy with which Sir Spencer states a case, nor on the abundance of his information, but on his eminently judicial temper, and on his sympathy, which enables him to understand and interpret men who differ absolutely in aims and deeds.

Posterity will in the main, I believe, confirm Sir Spencer's verdicts on the great issues and men that he takes up. But while his general outlines are lifelike, persons may not all agree on the lights and shades. Thus, the somewhat scant credit given to Grant as a commander would be modified if Sir Spencer took sufficiently into account Grant's immense achievement west of the Alleghenies before he commanded the Army of the Potomac. Sir Spencer, like many Americans even, forgets Shiloh and Vicksburg and Chattanooga, and the other work of three campaigns which resulted in wresting the Mississippi valley from the Confederacy. To imply that Grant was only a mediocre general because he pounded away, regardless of slaughter, in the Wilderness, and to forget all his record in the west, is unfair. Relatively, Vicksburg was as difficult to capture as Sebastopol, yet Grant captured it in a fifth of the time and with probably only an eighth of the cost in men and money required by the English and French for Sebastopol. So, too, such a move as Grant's cutting loose from his base revealed in him military qualities of a very high order. Wellington, for example, never equaled that. It is evident that Sir Spencer does not realize that, although the south had a much smaller population than the north, the southern country, with its roadless forests and mountains, its unbridged rivers, and its infrequent towns, made defense easy. Since recent experience showed that it took ten Englishmen to displace one Boer, the tremendous advantage which geography may give to one side in war ought to need no further demonstration. The Confederacy had only one soldier to every three Union soldiers, yet the advantage of position may well have been worth the numerical odds.

Sir Spencer's view of Napoleon III is that which de la Gorce, Ollivier, Thouvenel, and other French historians and memoirists have recently made popular. Instead of the unprincipled Machiavellian whom Kinglake and Hugo painted, we are now shown an amiable dreamer, selfish, indeed, and ready to shed a little blood if it seemed expedient, but on the whole benevolently disposed, and prevented from being a model father of his people by the perverseness of an ungrateful minority. Much stress is now laid on Napoleon's disease, and the date when it is supposed to have rendered him unequal to the task of giving his best talents to governing is set farther and farther back. The work of palliation, if not of

whitewashing, has, I suspect, been overdone; and the final portrait of Napoleon III will display a usurper unscrupulous and merciless when thwarted, but with a not uncommon desire to make people happy when by so doing he could add to his prestige and live more comfortably himself. His recent extenuators may be challenged to cite any act of his in which his first consideration was not the strengthening of his dynasty instead of the good of France. It is now so evident that after 1861 his empire was a bubble, ready to burst at the first pinch, that historians who, like Walpole, state the facts, find it hard to make modern readers realize that down to 1870 Napoleon's contemporaries in the world at large believed him to be really the arbiter of Europe, and that even statesmen behind the scenes acted on that assumption.

To only two other large matters is there space to refer. Sir Spencer thinks that Italy could hardly have been united without Lord John Russell's good-will. Nobody can wish to deprive Lord John of the gratitude which Italians owe to him for his favorable attitude in 1859 and 1860; but to suppose that, even had the Tories remained in office, Cavour would not have succeeded in drawing Napoleon III into the war with Austria, or in annexing Central Italy and Sicily, is to assign undue importance to England's moral support. Cavour knew perfectly well that English cabinets, whether led by Derby or by Palmerston, would never send a single British battalion to help or hinder the Italian cause; and, when the crisis came, Cavour would have gone ahead and risked a diplomatic censure, which would have affected him no more than it did Bismarck in 1864. Cavour and Bismarck were statesmen of such different caliber from that of any of the statesmen who have directed the British Foreign Office that an Englishman may well fail to recognize that they did not make the success of their policy contingent on the Foreign Office's consent.

The second point is the high position as statesman and organizer to which Sir Spencer lifts Jefferson Davis. Southern writers have hitherto extolled the military side of the Confederacy and neglected the political and administrative side, even suggesting that Davis's interference in military matters was a constant source of trouble. Until some Southerner, with the fairness of Mr. Rhodes, writes from full knowledge the history of the Confederacy, most Americans will at least suspend judgment in regard to Jefferson Davis's "great qualities".

In conclusion, it should be said that, although Sir Spencer's work deals primarily with political and social movements in a large impersonal way, it has several admirable characterizations of public men. The analysis of Disraeli, the portrait of Gladstone, the summing up of Palmerston cannot henceforth be overlooked, and there are incidental sketches of many others. The total effect of the history is such that it deserves to rank with Mr. Rhodes's. We may hope that the remaining volumes may soon be completed, and that the publishers will issue a popular edition, congenial to the taste and purses of American readers, who do not understand the English publishers' preference for selling a

few hundred copies at five dollars a volume instead of several thousand copies at two dollars a volume. The two markets are apparently so dissimilar that special provision should be made for supplying the American, especially when a book like Sir Spencer Walpole's is fitted for a large audience.

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER.

*Abraham Lincoln and his Presidency.* By JOSEPH HARTWELL BARRETT, LL.D. (Cincinnati: The Robert Clarke Company. 1904. Two vols., pp. xi, 379; vii, 411.)

THE author of these volumes wrote the biography of Lincoln used for campaign purposes in 1860. He has been studying his subject more or less ever since. He saw Lincoln on various occasions and knew a number of his friends. One might expect, therefore, both of the elements of a good biography: contributions to our specific knowledge of the hero, and a distinct personal impression of him. The volumes give us neither. They have added no facts, which is excusable, after the thorough gleaning that has been made, and they are remarkable for their failure to evoke the personality, whether as private individual, orator, diplomat, father, husband, boy, or man. A biographer need not be an artist to put into his papers a living being. Herndon did it for Lincoln, probably, more vividly than any writer who has followed. Inaccurate in many details, he yet drew a portrait that was Lincoln. Accurate in most details, Mr. Barrett has drawn no portrait at all.

Moreover, the title is not exact. "Abraham Lincoln and the Battles of the Civil War" would describe more justly the contents of the book, which gives an elementary account of almost every important battle in the war, with most of which Lincoln had nothing to do, and gives no idea of the immensely complicated problems, political, military, and personal, with which the President was in constant struggle. In scope, therefore, as in treatment, the book is commonplace. Nor does it have that instinct for evidence which would recommend it to the critical sense. It is of the familiar type which receives with awe the testimony of some reverend individual who once knew somebody who knew Lincoln's parents. A sentence like this, for instance, is enough to take from one at once any remaining seriousness: "The Captain's bearing and his power on this occasion, according to accounts from some of the men in after years, impressed them as almost supernaturally grand" (I, 33). Of course Mr. Barrett is convinced that Lincoln lived "most happily" with his wife until his death — not that it is so very important, historically, whether he did or not, but it expresses the attitude of militant decorum which characterizes the typical commonplace biography of a great man. The treatment of the whole Cameron episode, which is crowded into a very brief space, would give a reader as sharp an idea as any part of the book of the author's fear of not being respectful, if he should happen to express anything with clearness. Of the coarser side of Lincoln's humor Mr.

Barrett says: "Nor was there any respect in which his stories or jokes were less commendable than those of worthy people in general" (II, 378). The only place where this attribute of carefully arranged and meaningless propriety is for an instant forgotten is when, in treating of experiences at the bar, the biographer tells of a fugitive-slave case in which Lincoln represented the owner, and observes: "It can hardly be supposed that Lincoln was at all disappointed in losing his case. It is a relief, however, to have so good a proof — after all that has been told to the contrary — that he had no invincible objection to a good client with a bad cause" (I, 56). This seems to me a most unfortunate incident to seize upon for an attempted first plunge into unfettered thinking, and it is recorded here, merely in justice, as the one case observed in two long volumes.

Lincoln was a man peculiarly ill adapted to dull and formal treatment, and peculiarly inspiring to any American with live thought and the zest for life. It is surprising, perhaps, that a biographer with such exceptional opportunities should be able to narrate nothing that is exclusively his own, but it is hardly less surprising that he should have been able to tell the well-known circumstances once again, and with elaboration, without striking off one page that really reflects anything of the moving, swarming scenes in which Lincoln lived, or of his own extremely vital personality.

NORMAN HAPGOOD.

*Memoirs of Henry Villard, Journalist and Financier, 1835-1900.*  
(Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company.  
1904. Two vols., pp. xi, 393; vi, 393.)

HENRY VILLARD, *né* Hilgard, having lived a rather gay life as a *Korps* student at Munich and thus incurred debts that he could not settle, was overcome by dread of the paternal wrath, of which he had already had much experience, and therefore migrated to America at the age of eighteen. His purpose was to repair his finances and on the basis of this to rehabilitate himself with the irate parent. The young man's chief equipment for his task seems to have been an abysmal ignorance of everything that could possibly contribute to a career in this country, beginning with the language. Yet forty years later he was able to commit to writing these memoirs, which embody the record of an influential participation in events, and a familiar intercourse with men whose mark has been most deeply impressed on the history not only of America but also of the whole civilized world.

The two volumes now published contain seven books devoted to his experiences, first in getting on his feet, as a law-student and general adventurer in the west, second as a newspaper reporter and correspondent in the same region, and third as a very successful war correspondent in both east and west during the Civil War. An eighth book covers the financial career through which he became so widely known in his later



years. This last book, written in the third person, is substantially his own version of a series of promoting exploits, with violent fluctuations of success and failure, in railroad enterprise. This version differs materially from others that have been current; but the whole matter is so largely concerned with purely private and personal affairs that it need not be examined at length in this place. The other parts of the *Memoirs*, on the other hand, written in the first person, contain matter that is of value to the general history of the times — in one or two instances of unique value. Not all the narrative of military events that appears in the volume, however, is the product of personal experience and observation. The account of the battle of Chickamauga, for example, which fills sixty-seven pages, represents merely Mr. Villard's interest in an affair at which he hoped to be present but which unfortunately took place while he was down with a severe illness. Moreover the military events which fell under his actual observation are described quite as much from the official records as from his own recollection. He displays none of that jaunty confidence, so often discernible in books of this kind, that the facts which came under his own eye were necessarily the essential features of a great battle or a prolonged campaign. He frankly assumes the character of a writer of history along with that of a writer of recollections. The result is that his narratives manifest exceedingly few of those vexatious errors of well-established fact which mar even the most entertaining books of reminiscence.

Mr. Villard's personal experience, in his capacity as war correspondent of first the *New York Herald* and then the *New York Tribune*, included the battles of first Bull Run, Shiloh, Perryville, Fredericksburg, and Chattanooga and the attack on the forts at Charleston by the fleet of monitors. All these are described with some fullness, but without important contribution to existing knowledge on the subject. Of distinctly greater suggestiveness from the historical point of view are his descriptions of life and general conditions in Illinois in the six years before the war, and his account of the famous Pike's Peak gold movement of 1859, by which the fortune of Colorado was determined.

Mr. Villard's most interesting experiences in Illinois were those in which he came in close contact with Lincoln and with Douglas. With the former he was brought casually into very close relations, and he tells a story of sitting alone with Lincoln on the floor of an empty freight-car for an hour and a half one showery evening, waiting for a train at a country station near Springfield. The conversation as described puts in most vivid light the element of clownishness that was never entirely suppressed in the make-up of the great President. But with all the evidence extant of his crudeness at this period, it is hard to believe that he, a man of forty-nine, should have confided to a strange newspaper reporter of twenty-three the ambitions of "Mary" (Mrs. Lincoln) and should have repudiated them with the remark, "Just think of such a sucker as me as President!" (I, 96).

For Douglas Mr. Villard conceived much greater respect than for



Lincoln. The "Little Giant" seems to have had the same charm for the young German that won so many young American followers to his cause. Villard's first meeting with Douglass was in Washington when, as the enthusiastic twenty-one-year-old Teutonic promoter of freedom for Kansas, he actually applied to Douglas for aid in getting a fund from the government for the purchase of land on which to locate settlers from the free states. Whether the reporter does full justice to the peremptoriness with which his proposition was rejected may be doubted. Later, Mr. Villard represented the *Staats-Zeitung* at four of the meetings in the famous Lincoln-Douglas debates. He records that "the unprejudiced mind felt at once" that Lincoln's arguments were "in consonance with the true spirit of American institutions". Villard's qualifications at that time for judging "American institutions" are set in a clear light by reference to his proposition to Douglas only two years before.

In addition to his experiences with Lincoln and Douglas in his earlier years, Mr. Villard records a particularly interesting visit to Bismarck after the latter's retirement from power. This meeting with the great nineteenth-century history-maker of Europe is no less vividly described than the earlier meetings with the great men of America, and the chapters dealing with Lincoln, Douglas, and Bismarck give to the *Memoirs*, without the aid of the other matter, an important place among historical material.

WILLIAM A. DUNNING.

*The Life of John A. Andrew, Governor of Massachusetts, 1861-1865.*

By HENRY GREENLEAF PEARSON. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company. 1904. Two volumes, pp. xv, 324; iii, 358.)

THE long-delayed "authoritative" life of one of the most conspicuous Americans in the period of the Civil War comes out in these handsome volumes. The immediate friends of this adopted son of Massachusetts have strangely neglected the plain duty of giving to Andrew's own generation some proper account of his striking career. Our author says modestly that "transparent" as Andrew was in his essential nature, his complete quality cannot be set forth by the pen. It is well-nigh impossible for the modern school to comprehend the conditions under which Howe, Sumner, Andrew, Higginson, and others began their campaign against slavery in New England. The enslavement of the negro has come to be regarded as an enormous accident in the development of a great people and a powerful state. Then it was held to be a disturbing cause, as important as all the powers it was throwing out of balance. In the middle nineteenth century conditions of race, economic life, evolution of government, all must be subordinated to the philanthropic plea for the black man. The nation can hardly be grateful enough to those individuals who in some way sought to free the American people from the heavy incubus of slavery, to render into practical politics the overmastering philanthropic idea.

It is not Mr. Pearson's fault that the book is late. There was ample

material at hand; for Massachusetts has preserved her records much better than any other state, and the person treated left some thirty thousand pages of correspondence. The author has used these vast stores freely, and generally with good results. His own style is luminous and agreeable, producing a narrative which never halts, when it is the writer's own. His page is picturesque in the best sense; not imaginative, but pictured in the acts of humankind and colored by human passion. This portrait of Andrew is not an aggregate of personal features and peculiarities, but a dramatic rendering of the hero, acting under the profound and moving influence of the society around him.

The boy and student was rather inert than vigorous, though he was serious as well as jovial in temperament. Inheriting a religious mood from his mother, he was always conscious that life is serious. A talker rather than a worker, he manifested early the qualities of the advocate and orator. Yet he pursued law closely enough to obtain a good practice by his own efforts, and he married at thirty. In his twenty-third year he naturally drifted to the ministry of James Freeman Clarke, who was eight years older and whose guidance affected him materially. Clarke was wise, with a large mind — forecasting, seer-like, and prophetic in its insight. Clarke and the Howes must have positively influenced Andrew's whole career.

Andrew demonstrated that he could make emotion serve the reason in political agitation, and that he could lead audiences almost at will. That he was ahead of his time, on his nomination for governor in 1860, was shown clearly by Bowles in the *Springfield Republican* (I, 124): "His John Brown sympathies and speeches, his Garrisonian affiliations . . . and all that sort of extreme anti-slaveryism with which his record abounds, will . . . harm Lincoln". That such a man could absolutely lead the commonwealth of Webster and Everett, through four years of gigantic war, proved his honest and sincere character, as well as his intellectual power and ardent humanity.

Massachusetts in the Civil War is a fruitful theme well treated. Nothing could exceed the governor's energy, put forth in full beat with the throbbing might of the people. He drew to him at once the best men, like the sagacious Forbes, whose service was able and constant. Likewise, he could affiliate with some very indifferent citizens, appointing them to places of trust, to the disgust of his advisers. The gifted and patriotic Henry Lee voiced public sentiment in this severe reproof (II, 196): "if the Lord forgives knaves, he is equally forgiving to honest men, why will you therefore surround yourself with — . . . and a host of others to your great moral and mental woolgathering and to the disgust of your friends who are at least indifferent honest."

Mr. Pearson candidly admits that Andrew failed in comprehending Lincoln. The great descendant of the Puritans met the greater American, and the smaller vessel could not contain the larger. There was an ill-advised movement to put our hero into the President's cabinet in the spring of 1865.

He seriously considered the presidency of Antioch College in Ohio, to the "consternation" of his friends, in the words of the narrator. On the other hand, we may say, Forbes worked earnestly for it, believing it would open the way to the chief office of the nation, which Forbes thought was Andrew's due. It is perhaps useless to use the speculative "if"; but one nevertheless is tempted to say, that if Andrew could have prolonged his life in changed scenes, escaping the labor by which he earned \$30,000 per annum at the bar, and better escaping bores and beats whose persistence drove him to the grave, and if he could have lived in Ohio until 1876, he would have been President instead of Hayes.

Errors creep into careful work, as in the appearance of "B. F. Thomas, a well-known Democrat" (II, 43). The documentary citations are not felicitous, especially in the second volume. Page after page of Andrew's voluminous and hortatory matter do not forward a narrative. Such rhetoric should be digested by the masters, who can render "philosophy teaching by examples". The book is encumbered with too much historical detail. The subtitle justifies a history of the times of the Civil War; but other matters like the Know-nothing episode and the early history of antislavery in Massachusetts receive detailed treatment. Such tendency affects the author's narrative in many places. These are trifling defects, however, and on the whole the book justifies itself through its moving interest and its delightful story.

WM. B. WEEDEN.

*The Freedmen's Bureau: A Chapter in the History of Reconstruction.*

By PAUL SKEELS PEIRCE, PH.D. [The State University of Iowa Studies in Sociology, Economics, Politics, and History. Vol. III, No. 1.] (Iowa City: State University of Iowa. 1904. Pp. vii, 200.)

MR. PEIRCE'S monograph is a useful and scholarly contribution to the history of one of the many phases of Southern Reconstruction—a field of historical study which he very properly says has not received adequate attention from investigators. His work shows both industry and discrimination in the use of the voluminous documentary materials from which most of his information has been drawn. He has attempted to write a concise account of the origin, growth, organization, and activity of the Freedmen's Bureau and the part which it played in the southern states during the confusion and wreck following the sudden emancipation of the slave population. Of all the agencies and instrumentalities of the Reconstructionists there was none in the opinion of the Southern whites that did so little good as the Freedmen's Bureau. Its expenditures were enormous, its ramifications extended to the remotest communities, it directed an army of officials, and the powers which it exercised for the relief and protection of the freedmen were almost unlimited. The Southern whites complained that by supplying lazy freedmen with gener-

ous rations the Bureau encouraged idleness at a time when the farms were lying waste for lack of labor, while, through the political activity of its agents, race hatred was stirred up to the injury of both blacks and whites. But, as Mr. Peirce shows, wherever the Bureau was judiciously administered by honest and tactful agents it not only brought needed relief to many unfortunate blacks who were left adrift in the chaos of the time, but did a real service to the white planters by using its vast influence with the ignorant freedmen to induce them to enter into labor contracts and perform their agreements faithfully. His discussion of both the merits and shortcomings of the Bureau is eminently fair and judicial. He has endeavored to present the truth and has for the most part left his own opinions in the background.

As a natural preface to his study, the author reviews the conditions which gave rise to the necessity for government intervention in behalf of the freedmen, which began with the exodus from the plantations to the military camps as soon as the Federal armies appeared in the south. The antecedents of the Bureau are described under the following heads: (1) the system of relief provided by the military commanders for the new "contrabands"; (2) the treasury agencies created in 1861 to collect abandoned lands and colonize the freedmen thereon; and (3) the activity of religious and benevolent associations. Mr. Peirce then reviews the long contest in Congress to create a bureau of emancipation, beginning in 1863 and ending in 1865 with the creation of the Freedmen's Bureau, but without appropriation for its support and with its existence limited to one year. With a large income, however, from the lease of abandoned lands and the sale of confiscated property the Bureau justified its creation, and a bill was easily passed in 1866, in spite of the executive veto, to continue its existence. The bill was renewed from time to time until 1872, when the Bureau was finally abolished. Its various activities, educational, relief, financial, political, etc., are the subject of an interesting chapter. The Steedman-Fullerton investigation of the conduct of the Bureau and the charges against General Howard are carefully examined in the light of all the evidence. With regard to the charges against General Howard, the author concludes (p. 112) that "many of them were recklessly and extravagantly made and that some were without the slightest foundation", although he finds that the general "certainly was not a strict constructionist" when it came to interpreting his official powers (p. 128).

If a word of criticism may be passed upon Mr. Peirce's work, it should be said that he has not treated intimately the activity of the Freedmen's Bureau in its efforts to afford judicial protection to the blacks through special tribunals of its own, and the resulting conflicts with the civil authorities. This was a source of endless friction and sometimes of bloody riots. Had the author not relied too closely on the Congressional documents for his information, he might have been able to throw much more light on this important phase of the subject.

JAMES WILFORD GARNER.

*Writings on American History, 1902.* By ERNEST C. RICHARDSON and A. E. MORSE. (Princeton: The Library book store. 1904. Pp. xxi, 294.)

THE beginning of this series of annual indexes to the literature of American history is an event upon which American historians are to be congratulated. Early in the history of the American Historical Association efforts were made by Mr. Paul Leicester Ford, Mr. A. Howard Clark, and Professor John M. Vincent to supply a bibliography of the writings of the members of the Association, or a record of the current literature of American history. The result of this private research was necessarily fragmentary. Now, however, we have assurance of a continued and complete—or at least more complete—record, since the work which Dr. Richardson has inaugurated in the volume in hand has been assumed by the Bureau of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution.

The first volume of the projected series of indexes is of singular interest. It consists of some 6,500 titles, comprising references to separate works and to articles in about 300 different periodicals. It includes, under the caption Periodicals and Transactions, an article on the serial literature of American history, which in some particulars supplements the very excellent list published by the New York Public Library in 1898. Under the general headings History, study, writing and teaching, Historical societies, Bibliography; under the geographical headings United States, Canada, Massachusetts, Virginia, Martinique, etc.; under the period headings Colonial period, American Revolution, Civil War, etc.; and under the special headings Education, Literature, Politics, Labor, etc., are numerous interesting references. Related subject headings are brought together in a classified index at the end of the volume. For example, under the heading American Revolution there is a reference not merely to the same heading in the alphabetical list, under which there are some eighty entries, but also to eighteen other heads, such as Boston siege, Declaration of Independence, and Loyalists, under which there are twenty-five additional entries. This is sufficient demonstration of the value of the contents of the work.

As to its method—and, as the editors say, the book is first of all an essay in method—there must of course be some difference of opinion. In the first place, as to the aim of the work: Should it be made of general use? and should it include references to general literature? or should it be an index to historical literature merely, for the use of historical students? The greater economy with which the work could be prepared and consulted, and the desirability of conformity to the plans for an international bibliography of the historical sciences make the latter, and a strict interpretation of the aim of the work, perhaps, preferable. And by a strict interpretation we mean one that shall exclude the great mass of popular narratives and descriptions, which are of little use to the student of to-day and will be of less use to the student of tomorrow; and

not only these, but the numerous descriptions of contemporary life and discussions of contemporary questions, which, although excellent material for the historian of the future, are of no value to the historian of the present and do not belong to a record of the historical activity of the present.

The description of the literature included within the purview of the compilers exhibits two notable features: definitions of the subjects, and appraisement of some of the books listed. The first of these renders the work of value as a dictionary as well as a bibliography, and the combination has its useful as well as its humorous aspects. But I am not sure that it is to be commended, and that, even in those cases where it has some use, better results could not be obtained by substituting a description of the book for the definition of the subject. The second feature of the entries, above referred to, is the appraisement of some of the books listed. These appraisements consist for the most part of quotations from reviews, more or less authoritative and more or less rhetorical. The result is interesting but somewhat disappointing. After reading a few pages of appraisement the felicitous phrases in common use among reviewers begin to cloy. Sentiment, moreover, tends to take the place of fact. For example, one work is described as complete, while another more complete but less popular work is simply described as interesting — "interesting from cover to cover", the phrase is. After Price's *Old Masters of the Blue Grass*, the note is, "Has sympathetically recalled the lives of six artists", but who the artists were the note does not tell. Of the author of another work we are informed on the authority of one reviewer that he did not make much use of the sources and on the authority of another that he depended mainly upon them. The trouble with this method, indeed, is similar to that with the older historical method, diction and secondary sources are allowed to take the place of science and the original sources. In elementary bibliographical works this is no doubt desirable and even necessary, but in a scientific work for reference use this seems unfortunate, the more so that the proper description of the literature listed is essential to its proper classification.

And the classification of the literature listed is as important a point as its selection and description. This the editors recognize. "For the special student," they say, "the classed form is usually counted best". Aiming at the instruction of the general reader, however, they have adopted in the present work the alphabetical subject form, with a classified index to supply in part the needs of the specialist. To speak frankly, this seems like putting the cart before the horse. Special bibliographies, like the International catalogue of scientific literature and like this, should be of most use to the specialist — indeed, their use by any one else should be discouraged. And to insure their use to the specialist they must be arranged as other scientific works are, by chapter and by paragraph, and indexed. In this way the literature relating to periods, to movements, and to institutions can be brought together as it cannot be either by duplication of entries or by a classified index. Students of American



history and antiquities are not generally interested in horse chairs, in Kansas post-offices, or in Oregon literature, but many are interested in the vehicles of colonial times, in the postal system, in American literature, and would prefer to see references to these subjects brought together in their logical place rather than scattered from A to Z. And unless one is to double the bulk of the work by duplication of entries, such an arrangement is necessary. For example, under the article Libraries in the classified index there are several entries referring to twenty-three different articles. But in the alphabetical list there are twenty-seven more of a similar character, among which are the most valuable contributions of the year, Mr. Larned's history of the Buffalo library and Mr. Foster's history of the libraries of Providence. Finally, there is this added advantage in a classified list, that classification requires a juster discrimination in the selection of material, and a more accurate description of it. One may doubt whether such articles as Bananas and Sponges would have crept into a classified list, and whether a work described as one of the most entertaining and instructive recollections of the antislavery conflict would not have been indexed under slavery as well as under Bowditch.

I have extended my remarks upon these questions of scope, description, and arrangement partly because the editors invited discussion of these points, and partly because of the importance of the work itself. As I said above, the beginning of this series of annual indexes to the literature of American history is an event upon which American historians are to be congratulated.

W. D. JOHNSTON.

*A Short History of Ancient Peoples.* By Robinson Souttar, M.A., D.C.L., with an introduction by the Rev. A. H. Sayce, M.A., D.D. (London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1903, New York, imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904, pp. xxiv, 728.) This is a useful compendium of the histories of Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, the Medes and Persians, the Hebrews, Phoenicia, Carthage, Greece, and Rome; of the 712 pages of text somewhat more than one-half is given to Greece and Rome. The style is clear, the narrative smooth and interesting; there are fourteen excellent maps and a tolerably good index. The history of each people is given separately; this plan occasions some repetitions, a necessary result of the interconnections of the various histories, but the repetitions are generally helpful. The best part of the book is that devoted to Greece and Rome. In the early history of Egypt and the Asiatic peoples the author appears to be less at home and not very well acquainted with modern critical methods and results. The statement (p. 26) that the mother of Amenhotep IV was a "princess of Northern Syria, and a worshipper of the solar disk" is incorrect. There is no "Egyptian legend of the Exodus" (p. 32): the author entirely misconceives the stele of Merenptah in which the name "Israel" occurs;



this Israel is settled in Canaan, and the inscription says merely that the king destroyed its crops. An Elamite king, Kudur-Lagamar, is spoken of (p. 85) as if the name appeared in inscriptions; but this is not the case. The description of Zoroastrianism (p. 147) is of the crudest, and in general the remarks on religious matters are of a primitive character. In regard to Hebrew political history the surprising statement is made (p. 206) that the Hebrew government was "republican in form, somewhat comparable to that of the United States"; the Hebrew monarchy was a despotism limited by revolt and assassination. It is hardly necessary to say that the Book of Daniel is not authority for the reign of Nebuchadnezzar (p. 97). The picture of Sparta (p. 353) does not do the city full justice. The unfortunate use of "transpired" for "occurred" is found on p. 656. In spite of these errors in details the volume is an excellent guide for the general reader.

C. H. TOY.

*Celtic Researches: Studies in the History and Distribution of the Ancient Goidelic Language and Peoples.* By Edward Williams Byron Nicholson, A.M. (Oxford and New York, Henry Frowde, 1904, pp. xviii, 212.) Mr. Nicholson's volume — partly a republication of earlier investigations and partly a continuation of them — deals principally with matters of philology, but certain historical considerations are involved. His main theses are the following: that Pictish was a Celtic language of the Goidelic branch, and the parent of modern Highland Gaelic; that the Belgæ also spoke Goidelic, and that the Belgic element in the British Isles was more wide-spread than has been hitherto supposed; and finally that the Goidelic language was spoken on the continent "with more or less continuity from the Danube to the mouth of the Loire, and from the Tagus and the Po to the mouth of the Rhine". In examining traces of the Belgæ in the British Isles Mr. Nicholson advances theories about the origin of the Manx Gaels and about the Firbolg of Irish legendary history; and as a kind of corollary to his doctrine of the Pictish origin of Highland Gaelic he denies the usual statement that the Pictish kingdom was conquered by the Dalriad Scots. His historical conclusions, for the most part, stand or fall with his linguistic arguments, and these are bold in conjecture, to say the least. The evidences for continental Goidelic are chiefly derived from a few inscriptions of which both the interpretation and the etymological analysis are extremely uncertain. The materials in hand must be regarded as too meager to afford a basis for any classification of Gaulish dialects. The data seem also insufficient, or at any rate remain too doubtful in character, for the settlement of the problem with regard to the insular Picts. The view has even gained acceptance of late that their language was not Indo-European, and Professor Rhys, working upon that theory, has tried to find in their vocabulary elements akin to the Basque. Mr. Nicholson has now restated the case for Celtic, and some of the arguments on his side are certainly hard to meet, though there are many difficulties in his interpretations of the inscriptions. For

the rest of his doctrine, however — that Pictish is the direct source of Scottish Gaelic — he produces no evidence of importance.

F. N. ROBINSON.

*Asser's Life of King Alfred; together with the Annals of Saint Neots, erroneously ascribed to Asser.* Edited, with introduction and commentary, by William Henry Stevenson, M.A., late Fellow of Exeter College. (Oxford, Clarendon Press; New York, Henry Frowde, 1904, pp. cxxxi, 386.) At last we have the long-sighed-for critical edition of Asser. It is not a disappointment. With the sure hand of the scholar Mr. Stevenson establishes and explains the text and defends its authenticity. That by dint of scholarship such certainty can be reached as to the true reading of a work whose one manuscript, itself corrupt, was long ago destroyed, and whose printed editions abound in alterations and interpolations, is most gratifying; but what especially gladdens the historian's heart is the cogent conclusiveness with which Mr. Stevenson brushes away the doubts that have assailed the authorship and the worth of the biography of Alfred. It was a happy thought to print in the same volume, for the use of the critical student, the worthless annals of Saint Neots, whence were drawn most of the interpolations which have discredited Asser's work. Mr. Stevenson's syntax, alas! lags sadly behind his scholarship. His sentences, often clumsy to obscurity, are sometimes hopelessly ambiguous.

G. L. BURR.

The well-known work of Ferdinand Gregorovius on Lucretia Borgia has lately been published in English: *Lucretia Borgia*, translated from the third German edition by John Leslie Garner. (New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1904, pp. xxiii, 378.) Written from material that was almost all new, and by a scholar of keen human sympathies, this work was recognized, from its appearance in 1874, as a distinct and interesting contribution to knowledge of the Borgias and of Renaissance Italy. The translation, which reads well and seems faithful, reproduces only the body of the original, together with small reductions of two of the three facsimiles accompanying it; the appendix of one hundred sixty-eight pages, containing sixty-five of the principal documents used by Gregorovius, is omitted. On the other hand some twenty-five full-page illustrations are given in the English edition, adding at least to its popular interest; and there is a table of chapters, and an index — neither of which virtues marks the German volume.

E. W. D.

*Beginnings of Maryland.* By Bernard C. Steiner, Ph.D. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series XXI, Nos. 8, 9, and 10.] (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1903, pp. 112.) The beginnings of a political unit appeal to students of history with such a peculiar interest that an account of them, even though recited

in somewhat minute detail, is sure to attract more than mere local attention, and accordingly we welcome the announcement in the introductory note of the monograph under review by a well-known writer on Maryland history that in the light of much new material he purposes to trace the *Beginnings of Maryland* "with the same minute care with which the citizens of Massachusetts have traced the beginnings of their Commonwealth".

It is especially upon the career of that picturesque personality and "evil genius", William Claiborne, in his relations both to the government of Maryland and to Cloberry and Company, that Dr. Steiner entertains his readers with new matter; but he also carefully examines the incidents of the first voyage, the selection of a site for the first planting, the colonists' first experience with the red men, their first impressions of the soil, the climate, and the bounty of nature in fruits and game, the first trade for furs, fish, and other commodities, the procuring of the first domestic animals, the first granting of land, the early relations between Catholics and Protestants, the complaints and claims of such characters as the Jesuits and Cornwallis to the lord proprietor, the activities of the first three legislative assemblies, the legal proceedings of the first courts of justice, and the earliest relations between Maryland and Virginia.

Dr. Steiner writes almost exclusively from material at first hand and cites copious references. Although he confines himself quite closely to the bare narrative, he at the same time makes his pages entertaining by manifesting a sympathetic spirit for most of the leading actors in the drama and a freedom from unfairness toward both friend and foe. Some of his readers, however, will wish that he had woven more of the fragmentary items of his foot-notes into the narrative.

N. D. M.

*White Servitude in Maryland, 1634-1820*, by E. I. McCormac [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series XXII, Nos. 3 and 4] (Baltimore, 1904, pp. 112), is the third of a series of monographs upon this important phase of colonial history. The first thorough investigation was made by Ballagh's *White Servitude in the Colony of Virginia* (J. H. U. Series XIII, Vols. 6 and 7, 1895); this was later followed by *Redemptioners and Indentured Servants in Pennsylvania*. (Supplement to *Yale Review*, Vol. X, No. 2, 1901) by K. F. Geiser.

Dr. McCormac's work may be said practically to complete the history of the institution of indentured service in America; for Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Maryland were the three great servant-importing colonies. The three monographs agree in general conclusions, and, as might be expected, are somewhat similar in treatment. Yet a comparison shows differences existing in the different colonies. In Virginia the population was almost entirely English, and it is here that we must seek the origin of the institution; in Maryland there was a greater infusion of Irish immigrants, and the convicts formed a larger proportion of the

servant class ; Pennsylvania had a still more heterogeneous population, but the Germans predominated, while the industrial interests were less in slaves and tobacco than in the other two colonies. Furthermore, the land system in Pennsylvania, though used to encourage immigration, was not so intimately connected with the importation of servants as in Maryland. This is shown in the second chapter of the monograph, which is an excellent account of the early land system in Maryland and its intimate connection with the beginnings of white servitude. "Up to 1682 the distribution of land was based almost entirely upon the importation of servants. There was no such thing as the direct purchase of land from the proprietor. Each settler who came into the province received 100 acres of land, but if he wished more he could only obtain it by importing servants."

The number and importance of the servants is shown in another chapter. The majority came from Great Britain, Ireland, and Virginia. Of the original inhabitants, the ratio of servants to freemen is estimated at about 6 to 1. Gradually the number of freemen increases over that of servants, due, in a measure, to the constant addition of freedmen. Contradicting the statement of Fiske that the lives of servants were protected only in theory, he states that "servants were protected in practice as well as in theory" (pp. 65-66) and cites court records to justify his statements. It is doubtful if, on the whole, the condition of the servant was as favorable as the chapter would indicate. However, he makes exceptions to his general statement, and a little later in the same chapter admits that between the extreme opinions as to their condition — and there were many — "a middle ground seems to be nearer the truth". A chapter on "Convicts" shows that Maryland "was especially the dumping-ground for English jails, and received more convicts than any other plantation on the continent". The whole number of convicts from Great Britain and Ireland between 1717 and 1775 is estimated at 50,000. The conclusion, which is justified by the chapters preceding it, states the important part that the institution played in the industrial history of Maryland and its effect upon the servants and the colony.

The work is based throughout upon original sources, largely from the archives of Maryland, contemporary letters, and pamphlets. Although without a proper bibliography, the monograph on the whole forms an important contribution to the literature upon this subject, and can be highly commended to the student of colonial history.

KARL F. GEISER.

*The English Statutes in Maryland*, by St. George Leakin Sioussat, Ph.D. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series XXI, Nos. 11 and 12], (Baltimore, 1903, pp. 111), is a study of arguments on a phase of the legal relations of mother-country and colony in an English proprietary province in which the theory of those relations early became a leading question of public law ; and Professor Sioussat has given the subject the close attention commensurate

with its importance. Unfortunately, however, his introduction to the matter is accompanied with a superfluity of verbiage.

After noting very briefly the early practice in Maryland with respect to the English statutes, he tells of the decisions of English judges, the opinions of crown lawyers, and the popular attitude toward the question in the Carolinas, Pennsylvania, and Jamaica, showing in every instance cited — except that of the popular attitude of Jamaica, where the conditions were decidedly different — that the drift of the controversy was in the main counter to the contention of the popular party in Maryland. The heated discussions in Maryland, lasting from 1722 to 1732, is next passed in review, and the conclusion is reached that the popular party won the substance of its contentions. Then the study closes with an effort to discover the effect of the dispute on the later history of the province; and here Professor Sioussat is pleased to find presented, at so early a day, the political theory of natural right and government by consent. The English of the book is unfortunately marked by a want of accuracy and precision in the choice of words and by a want of fluency in expression.

N. D. M.

*Die Staatsumwälzung in Dänemark im Jahre 1660.* Von John O. Evjen. (Leipzig, Emil Glausch, 1903, pp. 186.) The theme of this inaugural dissertation is the Danish revolution of 1660, by which the monarchy lost its elective character and was made hereditary and practically absolute. Up to the present time historians have generally agreed that this was the result of an action long and carefully planned, the work of a conspiracy, the principal members of which were the king, the chief magistrate of Copenhagen, and the bishop of Zealand. Dr. Evjen, however, takes a radically different view: there was no conspiracy, no previous plan; the whole movement was spontaneous and rose out of the necessities of the situation. Angered by the refusal of the nobility to agree to reasonable economic reforms, the lower estates determined to humble the aristocracy by increasing the royal power. According to Dr. Evjen's understanding of the sources, this determination dates from October 4; nine days later Frederick III was declared a hereditary monarch.

The author gives a fairly sufficient summary of the political and economic situation in 1660, he traces the course of events through the autumn months of that year, and discusses fully the significance of the royal decrees that grew out of the action taken by the estates. But the really important part of his work is an excursus in which he discusses certain questionable sources from which writers have drawn at some time or other. One of these is Nils Slange's account of this event, which contains a document purporting to be a letter written by the king himself on September 26 to some of his associates in the plot. This letter has been accepted as genuine by reputable writers for more than a century. As everything hinges on the authenticity of this document, the author

makes a vigorous effort to show that it is merely a very successful forgery. It must be admitted that his analysis of the letter, as well as of the general situation at the time of its supposed date, reveals a thorough knowledge of the entire movement, and the reader will be likely to accept his conclusions. The argument is, however, not wholly convincing, and the part played by Frederick III in this event, so important to himself and to his kingdom, is still somewhat of a mystery.

LAURENCE M. LARSON.

Books about Scotland written by Englishmen before the Union are not too numerous; and among the best of them will now have to be included *A Journey to Edenborough in Scotland*, by Joseph Taylor, late of the Inner Temple, with notes by William Cowan (Edinburgh, William Brown). The book is not a reprint. It is from Taylor's original manuscript; and the manuscript having been unearthed, it was certainly worth the care which has been given to it by the editor and the printer. Only a portion of it deals with Scotland; for Taylor describes the towns and country he went through in this journey in 1705 from London to Edinburgh. There are many good pictures of social life in England two centuries ago, and here and there glimpses of some municipal conditions which are not to be found in histories of municipal England or even in the histories of the particular cities and towns which Taylor visited. He gives most attention to such conditions at York and Newcastle-on-Tyne. At Newcastle the municipality in the early years of the eighteenth century had a revenue of nearly £10,000 a year, arising chiefly out of the sale of coal and the handling of ballast, "which makes it", Taylor states, "the most flourishing town in the North of England". "They have", he adds, "a very advantageous proverb amongst them, which is, that they pay nothing for the Way, the Word, nor the Water; for the Ministers are maintained, the streets paved, and the conduits kept up at the public charge of the Town". The mayor was allowed £700 a year for his table, and an additional £100 for entertaining the judges when they came on circuit to Newcastle. It is, however, the Scotch part of Taylor's narrative which gives it its principal value. Taylor was a barrister. He was in attendance as a visitor in the old Parliament House when it was determined to come into the Union, and when it was decided that the negotiations for the Union should be by commissioners, a form of procedure which resulted in such advantages to Scotland; and he sets down his notes of these historic proceedings with all the detail, precision, and care of a man trained in the law. Typographically the book shows Edinburgh printing in its highest excellence; and it is perhaps because it is so beautifully printed that the edition is limited to 425 copies.

E. P.

*Steps in the Expansion of our Territory.* By Oscar P. Austin. (New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1903, pp. x, 258.) This volume is evidently intended as a summary of the "Expansion of the



Republic" series, in which it has been included. In little more than two hundred pages of coarsely printed text the author reviews the Spanish, French, and English colonization of North America; all of our wars, from the French and Indian War to the war with Spain; all of our accessions of territory, from the Louisiana purchase to the cession of the Philippines; the history of the controversies over public lands and slavery; the organization of all of our territories and the admission of all of our states. It goes without saying that the attempt to cover so much ground in so small a space results in nothing more than a very superficial sketch. If such a sketch is needed, the present one could hardly be improved. If, however, the author had confined himself to his principal subject and devoted his entire space to the political considerations which have either secured or delayed the admission of the various states, he would have presented a body of material which has not been brought together and have made a useful book.

The most serious error in the text is the confusion of the Floridas. Mr. Austin originally distinguishes correctly between East and West Florida, but later loses sight of the distinction, uses the terms in varying senses, and finally makes the wholly erroneous statement that "Spain sold West Florida to France in 1795". The reference to the charter of Georgia of a clause which it does not contain in the form quoted betrays his dependence upon secondary sources. The text is illustrated by over thirty maps, which fill about an eighth of the total number of pages. The text and maps repeat the errors in the author's report on "The Territorial Expansion of the United States", contained in the *Summary of Commerce and Finance* for September, 1901. These errors respect, first, the original division of the Northwest Territory; second, the boundaries of Michigan Territory as first established; third, the extent of Indiana Territory, after the organization of Illinois Territory in 1809; and fourth, the status of the territory roughly coterminous with the present state of Wyoming, after the creation of Montana Territory. These errors were explained at length in a notice of Gannett's *Boundaries of the United States* printed in the REVIEW for April, 1902.

F. H. HODDER.

In a translation by Mr. Arthur G. Chater, Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons offer to American readers *The Plot of the Placards at Rennes, 1802*, by Gilbert Augustin-Thierry. (London, Smith, Elder, and Company, 1903, pp. viii, 311.) The French original, *Le Complot des Libelles*, appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, October 15-December 1, 1902. Later it was issued as a volume with many confirmatory documents, omitted in this translation. When the referendum concerning Bonaparte's life consulate was before the French people, placards inciting the army against him were printed at Rennes and mailed from Paris to officers throughout France. The movement was soon traced to Rennes and crushed. Whether it contained the seed of a serious danger to Bonaparte seems doubtful. Bonaparte wished to ascribe the plot to Moreau.



Dubois, the prefect of police, convinced him however that it sprang from Bernadotte, a view in which the author concurs. The ostensible conductor of the conspiracy was Bernadotte's aide-de-camp, General Simon. Whether he acted on behalf of his chief, or, as he claimed, independently, was left at the time an open question and remains one still. Bonaparte, once the conspiracy was dead, lost interest; and Fouché, already in disfavor, feared to compromise himself in other directions if he brought home the plot either to Moreau, whom he suspected, or to Bernadotte. This work is the first of a series projected by the author on *Conspirators and Police*, and, aside from its narrower subject which it exhausts, it illustrates effectively these and kindred features of the Consular administration. Though based on research, the narrative is in popular style, and, well translated, it offers at once entertainment and instruction.

H. M. BOWMAN.

*I Martiri Cosentini del 1844. Documenti inediti.* Per Stanislao De Chiara. (Milan, Albrighi, Segati e C., 1904, pp. xxxviii, 157.) Few episodes in the history of Italy's struggles for unity have been made known so fully by the publication of documents, both official and unofficial, as the insurrection of Cosenza and the heroic expedition of the Bandiera brothers of 1844. This episode was comparatively unimportant in the extent of territory affected and in the number of its victims, but in the retrospect of history it stands sublimely great in its moral influence and in the heroic patriotism of its leaders in a forlorn hope. Mazzini published extracts from the letters of the Bandiera brothers immediately after their summary execution in 1844. Guardione published a much larger collection of their letters in 1894, and Silingardi another collection in 1896. Storino in his *La Sommosa Cosentina* (Cosenza, 1898) gives many documents upon the insurrection of March 15, including the despatches of B. di Battifarano, *intendente* of Calabria Citra, drawn from the state archives of Cosenza. Bonafede in *Sugli Avvenimenti de' Fratelli Bandiera* (Naples, 1848) and Ricciardi and Lattari in *Storia dei Fratelli Bandiera* (Florence, 1863) give many important documents upon the expedition, trial, and execution of the Bandiera, and Conflenti, *I Fratelli Bandiera* (Cosenza, 1862), gives other important documents, including the correspondence of Donadeo, commissary of police in Cosenza. Now the documents of De Chiara, drawn from the state archives and the royal *procura* of Cosenza, and for the most part unpublished, may be said to complete the historian's evidence upon both the insurrection and the Bandiera expedition; on the former De Chiara gives seventy-three documents, on the latter thirty-two; they consist in great part of the correspondence of Dalia, *procuratore generale* of the grand criminal court of Cosenza; on the Bandiera expedition some of the documents are reports of Giovanni De Giovanni, royal judge in San Giovanni in Fiore. Dalia was a conscientious magistrate, and the moderation which characterized the fulfilment of his duties in 1844 appears clearly in his reports. They are exceptionally trustworthy and of the first importance. De Giovanni

appears in striking contrast to Dalia. His zeal against the insurgents was such that he wished to give himself the pleasure "of escorting the prisoners from San Giovanni in Fiore to Cosenza, marching with a musket on his shoulder at the head of the police" — peculiar conduct this for a judge, but worthily representing Bourbon justice, which rewarded him with the decoration of *cavaliere* of the royal order of Francis I. His reports illustrate perfectly the spirit of the justice which emanated from Naples.

De Chiara's introduction had been previously published in the *Rivista Storica del Risorgimento*, III (Turin, 1900). It is of considerable interest, but is by no means a complete and definitive monograph such as it is now possible for a historian to write with these new documents at his disposal. The volume is published as number three in the fourth series of the *Biblioteca Storica del Risorgimento Italiano*, an important collection of monographs of which the publication had been suspended for two years, and has only now been resumed.

H. NELSON GAY.

Mr. Rollo Ogden's *William Hickling Prescott*, in the "American Men of Letters" series (Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, and Company, 1904, pp. x, 239), makes no pretensions to being anything more than an appendix to Ticknor's life of the historian. Mr. Ogden has had access to the Prescott family papers, including the long series of diaries and "Literary Memorandum Books", and he prints extracts from these, from correspondence not used by Ticknor, and quotations from a wide variety of other sources relating to his subject. It is a welcome addition to the all too little material available in regard to the man who did more than almost any other in his generation to win recognition and respect for American literary effort in Europe.

G. P. W.

*Seventy-five Years in Old Virginia, with some Account of the Life of the Author and some History of the People amongst whom his Lot was cast.* By John Herbert Claiborne, M.A., M.D., lately Major and Surgeon of the Twelfth Virginia Infantry, etc. (New York and Washington, The Neale Publishing Company, 1904, pp. xvi, 360.) These are the reminiscences of an original secessionist of Petersburg, Virginia. The author was in a position during the latter years of the war to see and hear much that would interest the historian and a good deal of what he saw and heard has been put into his book. He is unreconstructed and therefore views everything through partizan eyes; yet he is not vindictive nor even uncharitable to the "real" soldiers whose business it was to conquer him.

The chapters dealing with Petersburg just prior to the war, "Politics of the Ante-Bellum Period", and the fall of Richmond and Petersburg, with the surrender at Appomattox, in which he had a part, are the most important. He was a member of the legislature in 1859-1860, and in describing his own share in the movement looking towards secession he says (p. 145):

But the position which I took, and which the Secessionists, one with me, assumed, seemed the only safe exit out of the difficulties which environed the State. It was reasonable and consonant with all experience to say that the time to oppose any difficulty was in its inception, and that a bold, determined front, and a readiness for the fray, was the surest road to safety. Had the people of Virginia shown their unity of purpose, instead of division and instead of tampering with compromise, occasion would never have arisen for the exercise of armed resistance.

Doctor Claiborne believes in and defends the caste system which slavery engendered, and he speaks of the ancient Southern civilization as follows :

Capital did not seek to throttle labor, labor did not strike for protection. There was no Socialist . . . the anarchist did not stand with pistol and stiletto ready to stab any representative of honest government in his way . . . It is difficult for one who has witnessed the desolation of a country . . . who has seen the highest order of civilization, the structure of the bravest men and of the fairest women of all time, go down in a darkness upon which day can never again break ; who has felt the steel in his own body and the iron in his own soul, to submit with meekness to it all, and to suffer in silence.

While the author is thus uncompromisingly Southern, his work has decided value to the student of Virginia history, especially on its local side, and the two speeches made in January, 1860, show well what his party, then in the minority in Virginia, decided to do.

W. E. D.

*Custoza, 1866.* Per Maggior Generale Alberto Pollio. (Turin, Roux e Viarengo, 1903, pp. 439.) The present volume is the first complete critical military study published in Italy upon this first phase of the Austro-Italian campaign of 1866. It is based largely upon published sources, and makes no contribution of new documents ; but it is an excellent piece of work, exhaustive and profound in its examination of conditions and events, and impartial and frank in its criticisms. Pollio praises Austrian valor almost to excess and eulogizes most of the Austrian generals. Italy lost, he says, because of errors of direction, and for want of firmness or obstinacy. Her failure to scout thoroughly on June 23 was fatal. Had the Austrian positions been known, the Italian troops would have been differently placed, and large bodies of troops would not have been out of action on the twenty-fourth. Had the battle been resumed on the twenty-fifth as Victor Emmanuel with his good sense wished, a great error would not have been committed. Archduke Albert strove for a tactical success. That this became a disaster for the Italians was not his merit but their fault. Pollio charges La Marmora with gross incompetence as commander-in-chief, and Della Rocca with having completely failed to understand the situation. However, Brignone acted "as a true general of battle", and Govone, Cugia, and others distinguished themselves for intelligence as well as for bravery.

The volume in its moderation, its elevated patriotism, and its pro-

found knowledge of military science does high honor to the Italian army of to-day, in which Pollio holds the grade of major-general. The last word is for the future: "Let the day of supreme test come when and how it will. We believe that then a cry will recall the memories of the past, but will obliterate their sadness—the cry of victory!"

H. NELSON GAY.

A biography of a member of an old English Catholic landed family usually has a peculiar interest; for if it is well done it cannot fail to supplement Amherst's *History of Catholic Emancipation*. Amherst's was a labor of love, and he laid students of English religious, political, and social history under a debt for his two volumes. Still he could not cover the whole field, particularly on the social and educational sides; and much new matter has come to light since Amherst published his history in 1886. The *Memoirs of Sir Edward Blount, K. C. B.* (edited by Stuart J. Reid and published by Longmans, Green, and Co., London and New York, 1902, pp. vi, 308) are consequently welcome from this and other points of view. Blount was for a short time in the diplomatic service; but his working life was spent as a banker and railway director in Paris. English capital built the early French railways. They were equipped with English plant, and manned with English locomotive engineers. Blount was a director of railways so constructed and worked; and perhaps the most generally valuable chapters of his reminiscences are those which show to what a great extent the railways of France were influenced by English control and English management. Blount was British consul in Paris during the siege, and not the least interesting part of his good-humoredly written memoirs is that which tells how he handled affairs after Lord Lyons, the British Ambassador, and the British military attaché as well as the British consul, had deemed it expedient to betake themselves out of the beleaguered city.

*John Addington Symonds: a Biography.* (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903, pp. xxiv, 495.) The chief criticism made upon Mr. H. F. Brown's biography of Symonds, first published in 1895, was that it was too uniformly gloomy; that while setting forth the picture which Symonds drew of himself in his diaries and letters and autobiography, it did not after all present him as he really appeared to those who knew him. This criticism, with others of less importance, Mr. Brown took into careful account when it became his duty to make revisions for a new edition, but decided that he at least could present no other portrait. He must leave the lines as already drawn, especially since those living conversations in which Symonds seemed "youthfully enthusiastic, enthusiastically youthful" were never recorded. So the second edition of the biography differs in no essential respects from the first. It appears now, however, in less expensive form, in one rather than two volumes, and has at the end, instead of the heraldic note and list of writings, an index.

E. W. D.

## COMMUNICATIONS

To the editors of THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW :

I would not ask for a hearing in reply to the criticism of my *History of the United States for Secondary Schools*, which appeared in the July number of the REVIEW, (IX, 792-794) if I did not find errors in it that do me injustice, and which I have no doubt that you will wish to correct.

(1.) My "account of political development in Massachusetts Bay (pp. 65-66)" is said to be "crammed with errors", and the reviewer specifies four, represented as appearing in the following passage :

At the outset, the general body of the "freemen" of the colony could exercise their political franchise only by being present at the meetings called the "general court." They elected the twelve "assistants provided for in the charter;" the assistants elected the governor; the governor and assistants made and executed laws. But in the second year of the colony the yearly election of the governor was taken from the assistants and given to the general body of freemen; and in the third year a representative legislature was created, formed of deputies from each town.

On these statements the reviewer remarks, first, that "the charter did not provide for 'twelve' assistants, but for eighteen", in which he is correct; my error is indubitable; but in the comment that follows I find my critic less accurate. He says :

"At the outset" the assistants did not elect the governor—not until after a great unconstitutional usurpation, which is ignored in the account. The representative legislature was not created in the "third year" but in the fifth; and it was not composed as stated by Mr. Larned.

Now, the facts, as they appear in the *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay*, are these : At the first general court which assembled the whole company, held on October 19, 1630,

It was propounded if it were not the best course that the freemen should have the power of choosing assistants when there are to be chosen, and the assistants from amongst themselves to choose a governor and deputy governor, who with the assistants should have the power of making laws and choosing officers to execute the same. This was fully assented unto by the general vote of the people, and erection of hands. (*Records*, I, 79.)

As this action was on the occasion of the first meeting of the "general body of the freemen of the colony", only four months after their landing, and as it was the first exercise of "their political franchise", I claim strict correctness in my reference to it as being "at the outset" of the political development of the colony in Massachusetts Bay.

At a meeting of the general court held May 9, 1632 (in the second year of the colony),

It was generally agreed upon, by erection of hands, that the governor, deputy governor, and assistants should be chosen by the whole court of governor, deputy governor, assistants, and freemen, and that the governor shall always be chosen out of the assistants. (*Records*, I, 95.)

Relative to the creation of the representative legislature, the testimony of the colony *Records* is this: The colonists began to arrive in Massachusetts Bay during June, 1630. That was the beginning of the existence of the colony they came to found, and the third year of the colony ended in June, 1633. I am wrong, therefore, in stating that the representative legislature was created in the third year, and my critic is equally wrong in ascribing it to the fifth year; for it was actually in the fourth year—on May 14, 1634—that the first general court of delegates was held. At that meeting it was

Ordered, that it shall be lawful for the freemen of every plantation to choose two or three of each town before every general court, to confer of and prepare such public business as by them shall be thought fit to consider of at the next general court, and that such persons as shall be hereafter so deputed by the freemen of [the] several plantations, to deal in their behalf, in the public affairs of the commonwealth, shall have the full power and voices of all the said freemen, derived to them for the making and establishing of laws, etc. (*Records*, I, 118.)

Plainly this authenticates my statement of the composition of the representative legislature, and does not sustain your reviewer's contradiction.

(2.) It is said by the reviewer that "The false idea that the Massachusetts Bay Company's charter was exceptional and liberal in character is strongly emphasized" in my account of it (p. 39). Against this construction of my treatment of the charter I appeal to the text. The single sentence that can seem to bear that emphasis is one which speaks of the charter as being "drawn in such terms that, by shrewd and bold management, a degree of independence which the king had not dreamed of was secured". I think you will agree with me that those terms of the charter which made it possible for the "governor and company" to carry it to New England and establish their seat of government there had precisely the effect I described.

(3.) I appeal again to the text of my book against the statement that "'English' ships, in the meaning of the Navigation Acts, are represented as excluding colonial ships". If my description of the navigation acts (pp. 111-112) is faulty, it is because I have made no representation whatever as to the meaning of the term "English ships".

(4.) Still further, I appeal to my own text for defense against a disparaging remark in the review, that "The great Intercolonial Committees [of correspondence] inaugurated by Virginia (p. 173) ought not to be confused in character or origin with the merely local committees within Massachusetts, or within any other colony". I cannot discover such confusion, in the slightest degree. After mentioning the institution of the local committees of correspondence in Massachusetts, in November, 1772, I have said that "A little later, in the spring of 1773, the



idea of the committees of correspondence was taken up in Virginia, and developed into an inter-colonial system of consultation and agreement"; and this is a statement of simple fact.

(5.) I am unjustly represented by such a remark in the review as this: "Foolish as were the acts of the government of George III., we hardly expect in this day to hear a sober text-book apply to them the epithet of 'atrocious despotism'". Your readers will understand from this that I have so characterized "the acts of the government of George III." in some general way; whereas the fact is that I apply the epithet "atrocious despotism" (p. 175) specifically and only to those acts of Parliament that were adopted for the punishment of Boston and Massachusetts after the doings of the "tea-party". Mr. Fiske has characterized those acts as "measures for enslaving peaceful and law-abiding Englishmen", and as "edicts" that "one would naturally expect" "from the autocratic mouth of an Artaxerxes or an Abderrahman" (Fiske, *The American Revolution*, I, 98); and the latest English historian of the Revolution speaks of them as "bills for the restraint or the suppression of liberty", and as being a "baleful harvest", when they were passed (Trevelyan, *The American Revolution*, I, 186, 189). I judge that neither of these historians would find fault with my epithet.

(6.) To my statement that, in 1775, "the Scotch-Irish inhabitants of Mecklenburg County [N. C.] adopted resolutions which are claimed to have been the first demand for independence that was uttered by any assembly of people", the critic objects that it "will countenance the exploded legend". Apparently he does not know that what has been "exploded" in the legend is not the fact of the adoption of such resolutions, but the claim that they contained phrases which Jefferson used afterward in drafting the Declaration in 1776.

(7.) It is objected to my account of the conflict of 1771 with the "Regulators" of the Carolinas, that the Regulators "appear as warring solely against 'royal' authorities". The Carolinas were crown colonies, and the judicial and executive authorities in them which the Regulators resisted were "royal" authorities, strictly so; and the source of the trouble with them was in the higher "royal" authority, exercised in England, where attempts by the provincial assemblies to redress the grievances of the "up country" settlers were hindered by the king and the privy council.

(8.) Alluding to my remark that the Virginia Assembly of 1619 was "probably the first colonial legislature in the world since those of the ancient Greeks", the reviewer observes with some sarcasm of tone that it "flatters the Greeks and depreciates the later Romans and the very much later English colonists in Ireland". This intimates, of course, that my critic has sure knowledge of the existence in the Roman colonies of legislatures comparable with those of the English colonies in America; but I beg leave to doubt his ability to produce good evidence of the fact. Greenidge says of the Roman colonies:



None of these communities of Roman citizens possessed a true civic organisation of its own. We cannot define the rights of their town-councils, we cannot assert the absolute non-existence of popular gatherings for certain purposes; but the absence of the *imperium* and of a true judicial magistracy is clearly discerned. (Greenidge, *Roman Public Life*, 301.)

As for Ireland, it does not come legitimately within the category of colonies. It was a conquered country, occupied by some of the conquerors, and governed as a "lordship" of the English kings, until declared to be a kingdom, appertaining to those kings.

On these points I find the criticism of my book by your reviewer erroneous and unjust to it. On some others I question the soundness of opinions expressed by the reviewer; but I ask no space for discussing those. On the other hand, in several instances of inaccurate statement I stand corrected by the writer of the review, and am grateful to him for pointing them out. The Massachusetts charter provided for eighteen assistants, not twelve. It was not the "old royal charter of Rhode Island", but legislation under it, that restricted the suffrage so long in Rhode Island. It was not in 1619, but in 1618, that the London Company gave the Virginia planters "a hand in the government of themselves". It is not a correct use of terms to describe the Stamp Act as one imposing "a direct tax". It was not till March, 1787, that Washington consented fully to be a delegate to the Constitutional Convention. It was a plurality, not a majority of the second votes in 1789, that made John Adams vice-president. The Constitution did not "require", but permitted Congress to prohibit the importation of slaves after 1808. My foot-note on the ordinance of 1784 is inaccurate. I trust you will permit me to acknowledge these errors, and to express my thanks for the detection of them.

Moreover, I wish to confess that your reviewer, in his characterization of myself and my work, rests his criticisms on a basis of truth. I have never been a teacher, and to call me a "historian" would be using that title, I admit, in too liberal a sense; for I have not given to any particular section of history the minute, close, searching, special study which produces the authoritative historian of that section, and which qualifies the teacher for exactness of teaching in some special field. My want of such a specialization of historical knowledge exposes me, no doubt, to small inaccuracies, of the kind noted by your reviewer, and sometimes, perhaps, to mistaken views; and the consciousness of this would have deterred me from undertaking to prepare any text-book of history, if I had not seen reason to conclude that, when the specialists in particular fields of history put their knowledge into books, they labor under disadvantages that differ from mine, but that may be quite as serious in the result. It seems to be very difficult for a writer whose mind is filled with the minutiae of a historical subject to see it in perspective, clearly, and to be able to present it effectively to readers and students, not in its details, but as a whole. I see evidence of this in text-books that, prob-

ably, have no such flaws as your reviewer finds in mine. Of the two kinds of defect, which mars a school-book more? I may be wrong, but I would not willingly lose the commendation given to my book in the first six lines of your review, if I could escape thereby all the criticism that comes after.

J. N. LARNED.

To the editors of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW:

In regard to the above communication from Mr. Larned I call attention to the following points:

(1) After notice has been drawn to the matter, Mr. Larned reiterates that the "representative legislature" of 1634 in Massachusetts was composed of "deputies from each town". He even quotes from the *Records* to substantiate what might otherwise be considered merely a careless statement. Of course that "legislature" in fact was composed (1) of a necessary quorum, at least, of the "Assistants" (who were elected "at large") and (2) of the "deputies from each town." Moreover, the first element, which Mr. Larned omits, was in practice the controlling one for many years, and much important history turns upon the contests in the General Court between the Assistants and deputies. Mr. Larned's extract from the *Records* is correct, but his interpretation of it is not — apparently because he does not connect it with the charter organization of the General Court and because he fails to get the historical connection between that and the organization in 1634.

(2) As to the Mecklenburg Resolutions, Mr. Larned, to use his own words, "apparently does not know" that what has been exploded is just the claim he sanctions — that they constitute any kind of a demand for "independence".

(3) Mr. Larned defends the passage in which he styles the Virginia Assembly of 1619 "probably the first colonial legislature in the world since those of the ancient Greeks". He throws out the Roman colonies because their civic organization lacked the "*imperium*" and "a true judicial magistracy". Does Mr. Larned hold, then, that the Virginia Assembly of 1619 had any power corresponding to the *imperium*, or that the settlers in any capacity at that time had "a true judicial magistracy"? If his objection throws out the Roman colonies, much more does it throw out his original statement.

I wish to be brief; and I take these points because they are susceptible of compact statement. I am confident that, with somewhat extended space, I could defend every other statement to which Mr. Larned objects, but I shall trespass no further upon your indulgence.

Respectfully,

WILLIS M. WEST.

## NOTES AND NEWS

The twentieth annual meeting of the American Historical Association will be held in Chicago on December 28, 29, and 30, 1904. Most of the sessions will take place at the University of Chicago, headquarters being established in the Reynolds Club House. Apart from the business meeting there will be but six sessions, one each morning and each evening. The meeting will be held jointly with the American Economic Association and with the newly formed American Political Science Association. It will open on Wednesday morning with the inaugural address of the first president of the new society, Professor Goodnow of Columbia, after which the three societies will separate for their remaining sessions, except that those of Wednesday and Friday evenings will be joint sessions of the historians and economists. At the former, held in the hall of the Chicago Historical Society, the presidential addresses will be delivered before these two societies; and there will be an exhibition of rare Americana from the libraries of Mr. Edward E. Ayer and the Society. The principal feature of Thursday's sessions will be a group of round-table conferences upon topics of interest to teachers and to the workers in state and local historical societies. It is expected that railroad arrangements of the usual sort will be effected, with perhaps a special train from the east. Professor J. Franklin Jameson of the University of Chicago is chairman of the Committee on Programme and secretary of the Committee on Local Arrangements, and may be addressed at 555 Lexington Avenue.

The death of M. Auguste Molinier, which occurred rather suddenly, on May 19, brings a heavy loss to history. Beginning with his thesis at the École des Chartes in 1873 he has written almost continuously, producing books and articles which will be of lasting service; and since 1893, when he became a professor in the École des Chartes, he has been an especially useful teacher. The principal monument of his earlier scientific activity is his laborious and fruitful revision of the *Histoire Générale de Languedoc*, on which he spent the greater part of ten years. Of his later work, the most generally serviceable portion will be the *Manuel des Sources de l'Histoire de France au Moyen Âge*, which he was happily able to finish, though the last fascicle and the index are not yet published. Of special moment among his other productions are *Les Obituaires Français au Moyen Âge* (1887) and the *Correspondance Administrative d'Alphonse de Poitiers*, two volumes (1894, 1900); while readers of the *Revue Historique* will recall his admirable "bulletins" of publications relating to medieval France. Leaving life at not quite fifty-three, he had much work in hand—such as two volumes of obituaries of the province of Sens and a popular general history of France in the Middle Ages—and many plans still to carry out, not the least of

them being a book on the communes of southern France. In the July number of the *Revue Historique* there is an appreciative account of the man and his work, by MM. Bémont and Monod.

Several historical scholars of Germany have died recently, among them Professors Konstantin Höhlbaum, of Giessen, Ottokar Lorenz, of Jena, and Friedrich Schirmacher, of Rostock. Professor Höhlbaum devoted himself chiefly to the history of the Hansa. He had a large part in the *Hansisches Urkundenbuch*, three volumes of which he compiled himself, and he furthered in other ways the studies in this field, notably by his two volumes of inventories of sixteenth century acts in the archives of Cologne. It was announced some years ago that he would write a comprehensive history of guilds in western Europe, but this work, for which he had exceptional preparation, is now left to others. He was yet in his fifty-fifth year. Dr. Lorenz had a longer and more rounded career. After some years in archive work he became professor of history in the University of Vienna in 1862, and shortly afterward published his *Deutsche Geschichte im xiii. und xiv. Jahrhundert* and his *Geschichte Ottokars ii. von Böhmen*. Among the numerous works he has produced since, one is necessarily of exceptionally general service, the manual of the sources of German history for the period following that covered by Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, from the middle of the thirteenth century, the third edition of which appeared in 1886-1887. In these last years we have had his *Kaiser Wilhelm und die Begründung des Reiches 1866-1871*, according to writings and communications of princes and statesmen that took part in it. He removed from Vienna to Jena in 1885. Professor Schirmacher, also of the older generation, was one of the last survivors of the inner circle that gathered around Ranke; and his writings, being chiefly concerned with great personalities, bear witness to his master's inspiration. He gained the attention of the learned world by his *Kaiser Friedrich II.*, and afterward, when in the prime of his powers, produced *Johann Albrecht I., Herzog von Mecklenburg*. In later life he was occupied with the *Geschichte von Spanien*, in the Heeren-Ukert-Lamprecht series. He had been in the faculty at Rostock for thirty-eight years.

Frederick Alexander Inderwick, who died this summer, was one of those Englishmen who find time, notwithstanding their professional labors, to devote considerable attention to historical studies. An eminent lawyer, his *Side-Lights on the Stuarts*, *The Interregnum, 1648-1660*, and *The King's Peace; a Historical Sketch of the English Law Courts*, have made him known as a historian as well.

It is proposed to erect within the precincts of Trinity College, Dublin, a statue as a memorial to the late W. E. H. Lecky. Contributions to this memorial may be sent to the "Honorary Treasurer, Lecky Memorial Fund," No. 36, Molesworth Street, Dublin, or to Henry C. Lea, 2000 Walnut Street, Philadelphia.

Mr. C. H. Firth has been made Regius Professor at Oxford, succeeding Frederick York Powell.

Dr. Thomas Walker Page has been appointed Associate Professor of Mediaeval History in the University of California.

Mr. Frederic Jesup Stimson has been elected Professor of Comparative Legislation, in Harvard University.

Among other appointments we note: Dr. William Bennett Munro, formerly of Williams College, and Dr. Francis Samuel Philbrick, to be instructors in government at Harvard; Mr. R. M. Johnston to be Lecturer on Modern Italian History at Harvard; Dr. Guy Hall Roberts to be assistant professor of history at Bowdoin; Dr. H. R. Shipman to be instructor in history at Dartmouth; Dr. Everett Kimball to be instructor in history at Smith; and Dr. A. H. Shearer to be instructor in history at Trinity, Hartford.

Harvard University has received the sum of \$100,000, from the estate of Dorman B. Eaton for the establishment of the Eaton Professorship of Civil Government, to which Professor A. Lawrence Lowell has been elected.

An announcement has been issued by the Germanic department of the University of Chicago concerning the Conrad Seipp Memorial German prizes, which are offered for the three best monographs on the subject: "The German Element in the United States with Special Reference to its Political, Moral, Social, and Educational Influence." The prizes are \$3,000, \$2,000 and \$1,000. The monographs which may be written in either German or English, are to be handed in on or before March 22, 1907. It is expected that the monograph selected for publication will make a book of 800 printed pages and that it will be published under the auspices of the university. The judges are also authorized to buy essays on special topics such as "Emigration from the Palatinate to the United States." Full information can be obtained by writing to Dr. H. K. Becker, of the University of Chicago.

Johns Hopkins University has awarded its John Marshall medal, for the best work in historical or political science, produced during the year by a graduate, to Professor Davis R. Dewey, in recognition of his *Financial History of the United States*.

Plans are under way for the formation of an American Bibliographical Society at the annual meeting of the American Library Association, which will be held at St. Louis, commencing October 17. The Bibliographical Society of Chicago has chosen an organization committee of which Worthington C. Ford is chairman, and which will call a meeting of those interested in bibliography.

An Archive Bureau has been organized in Stockholm, to be under the management of Dr. Rosman, in connection with the Royal Archives, and of G. Hedin. The coöperation of many of the ablest scholars in Sweden has been secured and the object of the bureau is to furnish information and material from libraries, archives and other sources, for historical, genealogical and statistical purposes.

The *Educational Review* for June contains a classified "Bibliography of Education for 1903" compiled by Isabel Ely Lord and James I. Wyer, Jr. The September number of the same periodical contains "The degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the United States", by Edward D. Perry, a statistical and historical survey.

Professor George P. Fisher's *Outlines of Universal History* is so well known that the revised edition which appeared lately needs here scarcely more than a mention. Corrections have been made, brief statements woven in here and there, reference lists freshened and additions made to the chapter on most recent history (New York, American Book Company).

"In *Success Among Nations* the attempt has been made to initiate the reader into the psychological view of History, by giving, in outline and by means of a few illustrations, a birds-eye view of the human forces that have raised some nations to the glory of success, while their absence has prevented other nations from holding their own in the battle for historic existence." So runs the first sentence of the preface to a new volume by Emil Reich (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1904, pp. xi, 293). Having studied both "numerous books and historic 'sources'", and "about a dozen highly differentiated modern nations, each in its own country", Dr. Reich makes bold, "after a *résumé* of success in the past", to try "to sketch the probable national successes of the future". He treats through eight chapters, of economic, political, intellectual and religious success; and then, through five more chapters, surveys in order, the Latin and the Slav nations, the Germans, Britain and the United States.

Two new volumes in "The World's Epoch-Makers" have lately come to hand. In *Descartes, Spinoza, and the New Philosophy*, James Iverach, of the United Free Church College, Aberdeen, has set forth, on the basis of wide reading, the main ideas of each of these thinkers to the neglect of less important matters. Thus the more theological part of Spinoza's writings and the main part of his political philosophy has been left aside. In *Rousseau and Naturalism in Life and Thought*, by W. H. Hudson, first the story of Rousseau's career is retold, naturally with much succinctness, and then, with this to elucidate his writings, in the second part of the book is given a broad outline of Rousseau's philosophy, with an indication of the nature and direction of its influence. (New York, imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903 and 1904 respectively).

Dr. Theodor Lindner, whose *Weltgeschichte seit der Völkerwanderung* has been noticed, so far as it has appeared, in the REVIEW, was recently made Rector of the University of Halle-Wittenberg. His inaugural address, on *Allgemeinesgeschichtliche Entwicklung* (Stuttgart and Berlin, J. G. Cotta, 1904, pp. 24), contains an uncommonly well expressed discussion of the relation between the forces of continuity and those of change as fundamental in history. The recent development and successes of Japan furnish an interesting concrete text for the more abstract thinking. We note also, in the field of historical theory, "Le Problème des Idées dans la



Synthèse Historique, à propos d'Ouvrages Récents", by H. Beer, in the April and June numbers of the *Revue de Synthèse Historique*; "La Causalité dans la Succession" by A. D. Xénopol, in the June number of the same periodical; and "Geschichte, Völkerkunde und historische Perspektive", by Friedrich Ratzel, in the *Historische Zeitschrift* (XCIII, 1).

The title of *Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History*, by Antonio Labriola, professor in the University of Rome, translated by Charles H. Kerr (Chicago, Charles H. Kerr and Company, 1904, pp. 246), is not definitely descriptive. The translator explains in a preface, however, that this is an English version of a work published at Rome in 1896, in which Labriola set forth socialist preconceptions in such a manner that his exposition has been held to mark a date in the history of socialism. There are two "essays", one commemorating the Communist Manifesto of 1848, the other treating of "Historical Materialism".

Among recent evidences of interest in ideas associated with the word solidarity are two papers read before the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences and published, together with observations by several members of the Academy, in a special pamphlet: *La Solidarité Sociale, ses Nouvelles Formules*, by E. d'Eichthal; *La Solidarité Sociale comme Principe des Lois*, by C. Brunot (Paris, Picard, 1903, pp. 155). These papers treat especially of the bearing of present conceptions of solidarity upon individual liberty. M. d'Eichthal sets forth that solidarity in the form of a principle of law is pregnant with collectivism; M. Brunot endeavors to define the veritable doctrine of solidarity and maintains that it fortifies rather than menaces the liberty of individuals.

#### ANCIENT HISTORY.

A history of Rome during the later Republic and the early Principate, in six volumes, by A. H. J. Greenidge, is announced by Messrs. Methuen, London. The first volume will cover the years 133-104 B. C.

A revised edition of Myers's *Ancient History* is among the late textbook publications. The part of the work relating to the Orient has been almost wholly rewritten; the Greek and Roman parts have been based respectively on the author's texts on Greece and Rome; a fourth part has been added on "The Romano-German or Transition Age"; and the book has been improved by selected lists of references and topics for study, and by many new maps and illustrations. With all its changes, however, it still bears the distinctive features of the old well-known work (New York, Ginn and Company).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. S. Ferguson, *The Oligarchic Revolution at Athens of the Year 103/2 B. C.* (*Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*, IV, 1); C. Callewaert, *Les premiers Chrétiens et l'Accusation de Lèse-Majesté* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, July).



## MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

A collection of texts relating to the history of Christianity has been undertaken by the house of Picard, Paris: *Textes et Documents pour l'Étude Historique du Christianisme*, under the direction of P. Lèjay and H. Hemmer. It will comprise such works and documents as are considered most useful to students of the subject; the Greek texts and the most difficult Latin pieces will be accompanied by a French translation; and the several numbers are to include no more than five hundred pages, each duodecimo, and are to be sold at no more than three-and-a-half francs. Eusebius's history, which opens the collection, is promised for this October.

The *Analecta Bollandiana*, which long since rendered itself indispensable to every student of hagiographical questions, is now facilitating its use by giving an index to its first twenty volumes. This index is being published in installments, beginning in the third fascicle of volume twenty-two, and comprises four parts; a simple table of contents of each volume; an alphabetical index of saints; an index of places and things; and an index of authors. There is in the current issue of the *Analecta* (XXIII., 2-3) a catalogue, with a number of appendices, of Latin hagiographical manuscripts in the public library of Rouen, by A. Poncelet.

A new edition of Bryce's classic *Holy Roman Empire*, revised and largely rewritten, and containing two new chapters and three maps, is announced for fall publication by Messrs. Macmillan.

An important work on the history of southern Italy and the Eastern Roman Empire from the accession of Basil I to the capture of Bari by the Normans, forms the ninetieth fascicle of the *Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*: "L'Italie Meridionale et l'Empire Byzantine (867-1071)", by J. Gay (Paris, Fontemoing).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Cartellieri, *Die Staufischen Kaiser und die Auffassung ihrer allgemeinen Politik* (Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher, XIII); E. Bertaux, *Les Français d'outre-mer, en Apulie et en Épire, au temps des Hohenstaufen d'Italie* (Revue Historique, July); G. Mollat, *Jean XXII (1316-1334) fut-il un Avare*, I (Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, July).

## MODERN HISTORY.

A second volume has lately appeared in the great collection of documents relating to the Council of Trent which has been undertaken by the Görresgesellschaft: *Diariorum, Actorum, Epistolarum, Tractatum nova Collectio*. T. IV. *Actorum Pars Prima: Monumenta Concilium Præcedentia, Trium Priorum Sessionum Acta*, prepared by S. Eshes (Freiburg, i. Br., Herder).

Some students of military history may be interested in four volumes of manuscript in possession of the American Philosophical Society, at

Philadelphia, and described by Mr. J. G. Rosengarten in Vol. XLII of the *Proceedings* of the society: "The Earl of Crawford's MS. History in the Library of the American Philosophical Society". The volumes contain journals and maps concerning voyages and campaigns of the years 1689 to 1739, materials which were drawn up by or at the dictation of John Lindsay, twentieth Earl of Crawford, and which were utilized, though only in large measure, for Rolt's *Memoirs* of the Earl.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Ch. de la Roncière, *Les Routes de l'Inde. Le Passage par les Poles et l'Isthme de Panama au Temps de Henri IV* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, July); A. Sorel, *Les Alliés et la Paix en 1813* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, from July 1).

#### GREAT BRITAIN.

Dr. A. C. Tilton has compiled, and published in the Wisconsin State Historical Societies "Bulletin of Information No. 21", *A Descriptive List of the Works on English History in the Library of the Society* (pp. 32). This list is selective, directing attention chiefly to works containing sources. The entire collection, it is estimated, numbers about fifteen thousand volumes.

A useful bit of work has been done in *Roman Roads in Britain*, by Thomas Codrington, which was added recently to the series on "Early Britain", published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (London, 1903, pp. 392). Resting on a combination of extensive personal observations with the other sources of information, Mr. Codrington takes up each of the great roads in order, beginning with Watling Street, and traces its course, together with the courses of smaller roads closely connected with it, in detail and with as much certainty as the evidence available seems to him to permit. He accompanies his descriptions with small maps in the text and with a large map at the end, in which we observe a number of differences from the map by Mr. Haverfield in the *Oxford Atlas* and from that on "Brittania" (revised by Mr. Haverfield) in the new Murray series: to mention but one case, in the matter of certainty as to the courses of roads between London, Colchester and Braughing.

A general review, by C. Petit-Dutaillis, of work relating to the history of England in the Middle Ages was begun in the June number of the *Revue de Synthèse Historique*.

Professor Paul Vinogradoff, whose *Villainage in England* is known to every student of early English history, has written a sequel to that work, a volume on *Growth of the Manor*, which is announced for publication this fall by Swan, Sonnenschein and Company.

A society for the publication of Episcopal registers and of other ecclesiastical documents of importance for English history has been founded in England: The Canterbury and York Society, with the archbishops of Canterbury and York as presidents. The registers, some of which go back to the thirteenth century, have been little utilized so far, save those of Lincoln and London.

The articles in the *English Historical Review* for July comprise continuations of Mrs. Armitage's "Early Norman Castles of England" and Professor Firth's "Clarendon's History of the Rebellion"; also a short account of Charles I's pepper transaction with the East India Company in 1640, by William Foster, and a tribute to Frederick York Powell by one of his former students, R. S. Rait.

The fifteenth century translation of the charters and deeds of Godstow Nunnery is being prepared for publication by the Early English Text Society, by the Rev. Andrew Clark.

An important book on *Industrial Organization in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, by G. Unwin, has been issued by the Oxford University Press. The author has utilized the archives of several of the industrial corporations of London.

The *Quarterly Journal of Economics* for August contains a short article on "The Authorship of the 'Book of Husbandry' and the 'Book of Surveying'," in which Professor E. F. Gay summarizes "this minor controversy" and adds some new items which he thinks strengthen the case for John Fitzherbert as against his brother, Sir Anthony.

The series of "Historical Monographs" edited by F. P. Barnard and published in London, by Messrs. Jack, begins auspiciously with a biography of Elizabeth's chief minister: *William Cecil, Lord Burghley*, by Augustus Jessopp.

The first number of the papers of the Bureau of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution is *The Influence of Grenville on Pitt's Foreign Policy, 1787-1798*, by E. D. Adams.

*The Office of Justice of the Peace in England in its Origin and Development*, by Charles Austin Beard, has been published as No. 1 of the twentieth volume of the Columbia University "Studies in History, Economics and Public Law".

A further series of the *Diaries of Henry Greville*, edited by the Countess of Strafford (formerly Viscountess Enfield), is to be published by Messrs. Smith, Elder and Company.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. R. Scott, *Scottish Industrial Undertakings before the Union*. I. (*Scottish Historical Review*, July); Walpole's "History of Twenty-five Years", (*Blackwood's Magazine*, August); H. A. L. Fisher, *The Last Generation: A Review of Walpole's "The History of Twenty-five Years"* (*Independent Review*, September).

#### FRANCE.

MM. Picard et Fils, Paris, propose to publish a *Collection de Cartulaires*, and thus, virtually, continue the now long interrupted series in the *Documents Inédits*. The new series is to begin with a bibliography of French cartularies, by H. Stein; and the other numbers already arranged for include the cartularies of the churches of Apt and Laon, of the abbey of Bonnevaux, the bishopric of Avignon, and Mont St.

Michel; also "La Pancarte Noire de Saint-Martin de Tours", and "Cartulaire Navarrais de Philippe III". Publication is to begin as soon as enough subscriptions are received.

The investigations and discussions which the recent work of Flach on *Les Origines d' l'Ancienne France* was destined to arouse have definitely begun. Students of feudal France will be interested in a criticism, by L. Halphen, of one of M. Flach's chief points: "La Royauté Française au XI<sup>e</sup> Siècle", in the *Revue Historique* for July.

The concluding (twenty-fourth) volume of the folio series of the *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France* was issued this year. It contains, especially, administrative inquests of the reign of St. Louis. It will be recalled that this collection is being continued in a quarto series.

Two of the articles of the July number of the *Revue des Questions Historiques* bear upon the history of Protestantism, on its Calvinistic side: "Procès de huit Evêques Français suspects de Calvinisme", by A. Degert, and "Les Eglises Calvinistes du Midi, le Cardinal Mazarin et Cromwell", by A. Cochin.

The Bishop of Beauvais, M. C. Douais, has in his possession a complete manuscript copy of a "Relation" covering the mission of M. Toussaint de Forbin-Janson to Italy in 1673, performed at the request of Louis XIV, with the object of bringing about a reconciliation between the Grand Duke of Tuscany, Cosmo III, and the Grand Duchess, Marguerite of Orleans. This document, M. Douais advises, contains many descriptions relating to Italy; it could not be utilized by M. Rodocanachi for his volume of two years ago on the unfortunate Marguerite; and it would not make such a bad figure among the literary works of the *grand siècle*. In order to make it known and if possible lead to its publication, he has lately brought out an account of the mission in which he gives considerable quotations from the "Relation": *La Mission de M. de Forbin-Janson Evêque de Marseille, plus tard Evêque de Beauvais, auprès du Grand Duc et de la Grande Duchesse de Toscane*. In the same volume he includes forty-two new pieces relating to the mission, being a selection from a much larger number in which he wishes to arouse similar interest (Paris, Picard, 1904, pp. vii, 204).

A collection of documents which will serve to clarify the history of early modern art in one of the principal centers of southern France will be found in a recent volume entitled *L'Art à Toulouse: Matériaux pour servir à son Histoire du XV<sup>e</sup> au XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, by C. Douais (Paris, Picard, 1904, pp. 214). These pieces were first published in the *Revue des Pyrénées*, rather out of the reach of most students, but are now easily accessible. They are drawn from the notarial archives of Toulouse, number in all eighty-eight, apply to the years 1452-1725, and offer information on both religious and civil architecture, sculpture, metal-work, embroidery, and glass-painting. Their collector has not utilized them, save to suggest one conclusion: that art at Toulouse in the period of the Renaissance was rather indigenous than of Italian origin.

The Oxford University Press, which sent out a dozen years ago the *Orators of the French Revolution*, edited by H. Morse Stephens, now has in preparation a collection of documents on the history of the Constituent Assembly, drawn mainly from Paris newspapers of the period. There are to be two volumes, edited by L. G. W. Legg.

The collection of documents on the history of public opinion at Paris which is being edited by M. Aulard attained lately to a second volume: *Paris sous le Consulat*, Vol. II (November 22, 1800, to April 20, 1802) (Paris, Cerf).

Professor Frank M. Anderson, of the University of Minnesota, has just brought out, through the H. W. Wilson Company, of Minneapolis, a collection of documents which will be welcomed by many teachers and students of modern French history: *The Constitutions and other Select Documents Illustrative of the History of France, 1789-1901*. There are in all one hundred and thirty-seven numbers, many of which include several pieces.

The second number in the series of publications of the *Revue de Synthèse Historique* upon "Les Régions de la France" is devoted to the historical material pertaining to the Lyonnais. It is by S. Charlèty, professor in the University of Lyons and editor of the *Revue d'Histoire de Lyon*. A brief introduction points out some of the difficulties and peculiarities of the history of this region owing to its lack of natural boundaries. The third number in the same series treats of Burgundy, and is by Professor Kleinclausz, of the University of Dijon. The first installment of it appeared in the *Revue de Synthèse Historique* for June.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. Grand, *Les Chartes de Commune de la Ville d'Allanche (1438-1490)* (*Revue de la Haute-Auvergne*, VI., 1); P. Grachon, *Le Conseil Royal et les Protestants en 1698. L'Enquête, la Question de la Messe et le Rôle de Bâville. I.* (*Revue Historique*, July); W. Bröcking, *Zur Forschung über die "Eiserne Maske"* (*Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, July); Kaunitz, *Mémoire sur la Cour de France (1752)* (*Revue de Paris*, August 1, 15).

#### ITALY.

A hearty welcome will be given to the new index of the *Rivista Storica Italiana*, from 1884 to 1901, in two volumes, compiled by the editor of the *Rivista*, C. Rinaudo. It will render convenient the use of a periodical which has given such full indications of publications and such a collection of reviews as make it an indispensable organ to students of Italian history.

We announce with pleasure that the publication of the new edition of the Muratori *Corpus* is renewed and promises to continue, at regular intervals, through the house of S. Lapi at Città di Castello. Four new fascicles appeared recently, bringing the total number now ready to twenty-five. The work of revision, which includes much amplification and correction, is being carried on by a number of scholars, under the direction of G. Carducci and V. Fiorini.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Guggenheim, *Marsilius von Padua und die Staatslehre des Aristoteles* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, July); G. Bourgin, *La Familia pontificia sotto Eugenio IV* (Archivio della R. Società Romana, XXVII, 1-2); E. Rodocanachi, *Le Mariage en Italie à l'Époque de la Renaissance* (Revue des Questions Historique, July).

#### GERMANY.

A new volume (XXXI) has been added this year to the "Scriptores" series of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, and with it the size of this series is changed, happily, from folio to quarto. It contains writings of Italian provenance, edited by O. Holder-Egger.

Dr. Georg Steinhausen, editor of the *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, has written a history of German civilization, that is now issuing, in fascicles, from the Bibliographisches Institut, Leipzig: *Geschichte der deutschen Kultur*.

A systematically arranged list of books and treatises relating to the German universities is now appearing through the house of Teubner, Leipzig: *Bibliographie der deutschen Universitäten*. This list aims to include all pieces published to the end of the year 1899, and is divided into three parts, the first of which, of over eight hundred and fifty pages, is now ready.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Ritter, *Wallensteins Eroberungspläne gegen Venedig, 1629* (Historische Zeitschrift, XCIII, 1); G. F. Preuss, *König Wilhelm III, Bayern und die grosse Allianz 1701* (Historische Zeitschrift, XCIII, 2); A. Stern, *Die Mutter des Freiherrn vom Stein und Lavater. Nach ihrem Briefwechsel* (Historische Zeitschrift, XCIII, 2); E. Wertheimer, *Die Revolutionierung Tirols im Jahre 1813* (Deutsche Rundschau, July and August); H. Freiherrn von Egloffstein, *Kaiser Wilhelm I. und Leopold von Orlich* (Deutsche Rundschau, June and August); F. Lorenz, *Zur Geschichte der Zensur und des Schriftwesens in Bayern* (Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, II, 3); Julius Kaerst, *Theodor Mommsen* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, July).

#### BELGIUM, NETHERLANDS.

We received only lately a copy of G. des Marez's *La Lettre de Foire à Ypres au XIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle, Contribution à l'Étude des Papiers de Crédit* (Brussels, Lamertin, 1901, pp. 292), printed separately from volume LX of the "Mémoires Couronnés et autres Mémoires" published by the Belgian Royal Academy. This substantial contribution to the study of matters of money and credit followed the author's discovery, in the archives of Ypres, of a collection of some eight thousand documents, ranging between the years 1249 and 1291. Over one hundred and fifty of these pieces he publishes here, in justification of many conclusions relating partly to the extrinsic features of the obligatory papers used at Ypres in the thirteenth century and partly to the legal and economic

demands they satisfied. Since the papers in question witnessed a debt payable at such or such a fair, M. des Marez has denominated them "lettres de foire", but it seems that he might better have termed them simply "lettres obligatoires", or "reconnaisances". Students who make use of the work should consult, in connection therewith, the long and competent review of it by P. Huvelin, in the *Revue Historique* for September-October, 1901. In the *Lettre de Foire* and the more recent *Organisation du Travail à Bruxelles au XI<sup>e</sup> Siècle* M. des Marez has begun a comprehensive work on commerce and industry in Belgium from the rise of the towns to the end of the old régime.

The royal commission founded in Holland in 1902 for the purpose of offering centralized, efficient guidance in the publication of historical sources has already demonstrated its usefulness in an eminent manner, by producing a survey of the gaps now existing in the national historiography and indicating, for successive periods, the sources it is most important to publish in order best to fill these gaps: *Overzicht van de door Bronnenpublicatie aan te vullen Leemten der Nederlandsche Geschiedkennis* (The Hague, Nijhoff, 1904, pp. ix, 103).

#### RUSSIA.

Among the new books to which contemporary developments in the Far East lend special interest, we note *Russia, her Strength and her Weakness*, by Wolf von Schierbrand (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904, pp. xv, 304, with two maps). The writer of it depends on information derived mainly from an extensive tour through European and Asiatic Russia and from "the best available and original resources, Russian by preference, and very largely official". From this and some other material he makes a study of the present conditions of the Russian empire — treating such matters as expansion, finances, industry, agriculture and the peasantry, church and morals, internal race strife, bureaucracy — and contends, by way of forecast, "that by pursuing for another considerable length of time the present policy of foreign aggression and utter disregard of internal needs, Russia is on the road to national perdition".

#### AMERICA.

Among the fall announcements not otherwise noted in this number of the REVIEW, the following are of interest: By Macmillan: *Reminiscences of Peace and War*, by Mrs. Roger A. Pryor; *The Declaration of Independence*, "an interpretation and an analysis", by Herbert Friedenwald; *Hakluytus Posthumus; or Purchas His Pilgrimes*, in twenty volumes; *The Industrial History of the United States*, by Katharine Coman. — By Houghton, Mifflin and Company: *Autobiography, Memories, and Experiences of Daniel Conway*; *The Evolution of the United States Constitution and the History of the Monroe Doctrine*, by John A. Kasson. — By A. S. Barnes and Company: a new and revised edition in two volumes of *Barnes' Popular History of the United States*. — By



G. P. Putnam's Sons: *The Story of the United States*, by Edwin Earle Sparks. — By A. C. McClurg and Company: Lahontan's *New Voyages to North America*, edited by R. G. Thwaites; Gass's *Journal of the Lewis and Clark Expedition*, edited by James K. Hosmer; *History of Negro Servitude in Illinois and of the Slavery Agitation in that State, 1719-1864*, by N. Dwight Harris. — By Fox, Duffield, and Company: first volume of *Virginia County Records*. — By the American Unitarian Association: a new edition of *The Works of William Ellery Channing*, with a biographical and critical introduction by John W. Chadwick.

The five volumes comprising "group I, — Foundations of the Nation", in *The American Nation* edited by Professor A. B. Hart (Harpers), are announced for immediate publication: they are *European Background of American History*, by E. P. Cheyney; *American Conditions of American History*, by Livingston Farrand; *Spain in America*, by E. G. Bourne; *England in America*, by L. G. Tyler, and *Colonial Self-Government*, by Charles M. Andrews.

The first volume of Professor Edward Channing's *History of the United States* is announced by Macmillan. The entire work is to be completed in several volumes, and marks the first attempt, since the beginning of Bancroft's work, on the part of a scholar of reputation to produce an extended comprehensive and critical study of the entire period, commencing with the early voyages. The first volume extends to 1660.

The first volume of *The United States: a History of Three Centuries*, by William Estabrook Chancellor and Fletcher Willis Hewes (Putnam's Sons), has just appeared. It covers the years 1607-1697. It is divided into four parts — population and politics, war and conquest, industry and commerce, and civilization.

*A History of the Military Government in Newly Acquired Territory of the United States*, by David Yancey Thomas, in the Columbia University Studies, is a timely work in an important and interesting field.

*The Department of Justice, its History and Functions*, by James S. Easby-Smith (Washington, Lowdermilk, 1904), is the only historical and descriptive sketch of the Department of Justice yet published. Mr. Easby-Smith is the pardon-attorney of the Department of Justice, and has prepared an exhaustive history of the department, soon to be published, of which this little volume is but a much abridged fore-runner. In its forty-seven pages, however, a brief sketch of the office of Attorney-General from 1789 to 1904, and accounts of the history and duties of each office and bureau in the department since 1870, the date when the Department of Justice was established, are to be found, while an appendix contains lists of the principal officers of the department, since the establishment of their respective offices, together with the dates of their terms of service.

The Library of Congress has published during the summer several reference lists compiled under the direction of Mr. A. P. C. Griffin, the

chief bibliographer. *A List of Works relating to the Germans in the United States*, contains over two hundred entries, covering colonial settlements, as well as modern migrations, but excluding biographies of distinguished Germans. *A List of Books (with References to Periodicals) relating to Proportional Representation*, contains about 120 book references, many of them amply annotated, with something over ninety references to articles in periodicals, scattered through the years from 1835 to date. Some titles on direct legislation and apportionment are included, but the initiative and referendum are not touched upon. The introduction, by Mr. Griffin, is a brief historical review of the literature of the subject. The *List of References on the Popular Election of Senators*, is a reprint, with additions, of Senate Document 404, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, which was compiled by the Library, and has an appendix containing the debates in the Federal Convention on the election of senators, and extracts from the *Federalist*.

The Library of Congress has issued as No. 5 of its "Notes for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition" a brief general description of the principal historical collections in the Division of Manuscripts. Among the more important recent accessions, not heretofore noted in the REVIEW are the Van Buren papers (about 10,000 pieces); the Andrew Johnson papers (all later than 1861, about 15,000 pieces); the Webster papers, being the 2,500 manuscripts selected for biographical purposes and not included in the New Hampshire Historical Society's collection; the papers of Commodore Edward Preble; the Ambler manuscripts, relating to Jamestown, Virginia, and vicinity, 1649-1774; the Robert Morris papers; papers of David Porter and John Barry; and the Spanish and Mexican archives from Santa Fé.

A list of the *Papers of James Monroe* "in chronological order from the original manuscripts in the Library of Congress" is already in press, as is also a list of the *Vernon-Wager MSS.* The Vernon-Wager manuscripts were obtained in the Peter Force purchase of 1867, and relate to British naval operations in the West Indies and on the coast of North America, about the time of the Revolution. Three facsimile reproductions will accompany this latter list, while with the former will be included a facsimile of Monroe's journal of the negotiations for the purchase of Louisiana.

Another and very important publication which the Library of Congress has under way is the *Journals of the Continental Congress*, edited by Worthington C. Ford. The first volume, covering the year 1774, is about to appear, and Mr. Ford has already issued separately: "Bibliographical Notes on the Issues of the Continental Congress, 1774", reprinted from the forthcoming volume.

An eight-volume series on "The American State", under the editorship of W. W. Willoughby, is announced by the Century Company. Three volumes are already published: *The American Constitutional Sys-*

tem, by the editor, *City Government in the United States*, by F. J. Goodnow, and *Party Organization*, by Jesse Macy. The remaining five are announced as being in active preparation; they are *The American Executive and Executive Methods*, by J. H. Finley; *American Legislatures and Legislative Methods*, by Paul R. Reinsch; *The American Judiciary*, by Simeon E. Baldwin; *Territories and Colonies*, by W. F. Willoughby; and *Local Government in the United States*, by John A. Fairlie.

*Les États-Unis au XX<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, by Pierre Leroy-Beaulieu (Paris, Armand Colin) is mainly descriptive; the work of a statistician chiefly interested in the industrial phases of American life.

Archer Butler Hulbert has under preparation a series of photographic reproductions of maps relating to America. The first volume will consist of about fifty maps of rivers, from the British Museum. Maps of towns, fortifications, battlefields, etc., will be included in subsequent volumes, and the series will be called *The Crown Collection of Historical Maps*.

The *New York Public Library Bulletin* for June and July contains Parts I and II of "A selected list of works in the New York Public Library relating to Naval History, Naval Administration, etc."

In an article on the "Voyages of the Cabots and of the Corte-Reals to North America and Greenland, 1497-1503", contributed by Mr. H. P. Biggar to the *Revue Hispanique*, for the latter half of 1903, the Cabot voyages are set in a new light. The phrase "E al tornor aldreto a visto do ixole" in Pasqualigo's despatch of August 13, 1497, is shown to mean merely "and on his way back he saw two islands", not "two islands to starboard", as many have supposed. In his first voyage of 1497, Cabot is made to land at Cape Breton. As to the second voyage Mr. Biggar shows that the "Cape Labrador", referred to by Gomara, was Cape Farewell, and that the region explored by Cabot in 1498, and named by him Labrador, was the east coast of Greenland. Since neither the Cabots nor the Corte-Reals in their voyages of 1500-1502, explored Davis Strait, they took that body of water to be merely a gulf. When, then, the Zeno map appeared in 1558, giving Greenland under its own name, the identity of the old Labrador with Greenland was forgotten. The article is illustrated with reproductions of twelve old maps.

We have received the first volume of *The Writings of Samuel Adams*, edited by Harry Alonzo Cushing (Putnam's Sons). It covers the period 1764-1769, and contains much valuable material, notwithstanding the fact that many of Adams's papers have been destroyed. The work will be completed in two or three more volumes and will receive an extended review in a later number.

We understand that the manuscript index to the official papers, in European archives, relating to the American Revolution, has been at last completed, through the efforts of Mrs. Stevens and Henry John Brown, her late husband's partner. This index, which includes the documents

in the English archives and private collections in Great Britain, and in Spanish, French and Dutch archives, comprises 180 folio volumes of 500 pages each; it is in three series: the first, of fifty volumes, gives the list of documents in the order they occupy in the archives; the second, of one hundred volumes, is chronological and descriptive, while the third, in thirty volumes, is alphabetical.

The Government Printing Office is publishing a facsimile of Thomas Jefferson's compilation, *The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth, Extracted textually from the Gospels in Greek, Latin, French and English*.

Dr. Ellis P. Oberholtzer is preparing for George W. Jacobs & Company an edition of the *Diary and Writings of Robert Morris*. The collection will include the important papers in the John Meredith Read "letter books", lately acquired by the Library of Congress, and letters preserved in other libraries, private and public. But a few of them have ever been published, and they will throw much new light upon the history of the Revolution. There will be several volumes, taking the form of a memorial edition, to be issued upon the centennial anniversary of the death of the long-neglected patriot.

*Letters from an American Farmer*, by John Hector St. John Crèvecoeur, reprinted from the original London edition of 1782, with a prefatory note by W. P. Trent, and an introduction by Ludwig Lewisohn, has been published by Fox, Duffield and Company. This is the only edition that has appeared since the Philadelphia reprint by Matthew Carey in 1793.

The *Revue Historique* for July-August contains an article of more than usual interest to students of American history: "Une Page peu connue de l'Histoire de France: la Guerre Franco-Américaine (1798-1801)", by George-Nestler Tricoche. It is pointed out that during "ce curieux incident diplomatique" France lost about ninety vessels of all kinds and a total of 700 guns.

In the *Monthly Bulletin of Books added to the Public Library of the City of Boston*, for August, is "A List of Regimental Histories and Official Records of Individual States in the Civil War", to be found in the Boston Public Library.

In the series of "American Crisis Biographies" (George W. Jacobs and Company, Philadelphia) the first volume to appear will be *Abraham Lincoln*, by the general editor, Ellis P. Oberholtzer. *Sherman*, by Edward Robbins, and *Frederick Douglass*, by Booker T. Washington, will follow.

*The United Service*, for July, has reprinted from its first series "Confederate Documents relating to Fort Sumter". The documents are from the records of the Executive Council of South Carolina, January 5-April 10, 1861, and consist of resolutions and decisions of the council and of correspondents with agents in Washington and the south. There is an introduction by Montgomery Blair.

A biography of Edwin M. Stanton, by Frank Abial Flower is to be brought out by the Saalfield Publishing Company. It is said to contain some new material.

The fifth volume of James Ford Rhodes's *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850*, soon to appear (Macmillan), commences with a recapitulation of the events of the Civil War, as far as 1864, and ends with the elections of 1866.

Numbers IV and V of "West Virginia University Documents Relating to Reconstruction", edited by Professor Walter L. Fleming, appear together. They contain "Public Frauds in South Carolina", "The Constitution of the Council of Safety", "A Local Ku Klux Constitution", and "The '76 Association".

An interesting picture of local and domestic life in a New Hampshire town of the eighteenth century is contained in *The Diary of Matthew Patten*, recently published by the town of Bedford. Patten was a justice of the peace in Bedford from 1751 to his death in 1795, and was also at various times judge of probate, representative to the general court, and member of the governor's council; the diary covers the years 1754-1788.

In *Old-Time Schools and School Books* (Macmillan) Clifton Johnson has brought together a great mass of curious and interesting information about early school buildings, appliances and text-books in America. Illustrations in the form of facsimiles are lavishly scattered throughout the text and the volume is a distinct contribution to our knowledge of this important, but obscure phase of social history. The schools of Massachusetts receive a large share of the author's attention.

Starting with the premise that "Boston is a state of mind", M. A. DeWolfe Howe, in *Boston, the Place and the People* (Macmillan), endeavors to illustrate the spirit of the New England metropolis, to show, by an account of its history, its personages and its institutions, just what elements make up the mental state called by its name. The book is largely historical; chapters on "Foundation and Early Years", "Colonial Boston", "Provincial Boston" and "Revolutionary Boston", narrate events, but particularly describe leading characters. In "The Hub and the Wheel" the beginnings of Boston's shipping are described, while other chapters take up certain phrases of Boston life and history, such as "The Boston Religion", "The 'Literary Center'", "The Slave and the Union".

In the *Essex Institute Historical Collections* for July is an article by Robert S. Rantoul on "The Date of the Founding of Salem", which he believes to be about 1626, instead of 1630, the date given in the *Manual of the General Court*.

*Half a Century with the Providence Journal*, "being a record of the events and associates connected with the past fifty years of the life of Henry R. Davis, secretary of the company", issued by the Journal Company, is neither a history of Rhode Island or Providence, nor a com-

plete history of the *Providence Journal*; but the fifty years covered have seen a revolution in the methods of journalism, and all the stages in this forward movement are adequately narrated. Much attention is given to the men who have made the paper, and to the influence upon its development exercised by Brown University.

A list of all the imprints (books, pamphlets and newspapers) from the seventy printing presses established in Connecticut between 1709 and 1800, has recently been published by the Acorn Club. This bibliography was prepared some twenty years ago by the late Dr. J. H. Trumbull, first librarian of the Watkinson Library, at Hartford. Along with it is a biographical sketch of Dr. Trumbull by Miss Annie E. Trumbull. The list contains 1,738 entries; it shows fewer political pamphlets of the Revolutionary period than might be expected, but gives twenty-six newspapers between 1755 and 1800.

The New York State Historical Association held its sixth annual meeting at Lake George, commencing August 16. One session was devoted to a symposium on "The Battle of Bennington-Walloomsac". Papers were read by Professor Herbert D. Foster, Nelson Gillespie, Robert R. Law, William O. Stillman and George G. Benedict.

Dodd, Mead and Company published in the spring *John Peter Zenger*, by Livingston Rutherford. This volume contains an account of Zenger's press and trial, and a bibliography of his imprints. A reprint of the first edition of the trial, as well as a number of portraits and facsimiles is also included.

The third and fourth volumes of *The Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York*, translated from the Dutch under the direction of Dr. E. T. Corwin and published by the state, have recently appeared. They cover the period between 1701 and 1750, and contain not only the translated records, but many others arranged under the direction of Mr. Hugh Hastings, the state historian.

The second volume of *Documents Relating to the Revolutionary History of the State of New Jersey*, edited for the New Jersey Historical Society by Francis B. Lee, covers the year 1778. It is composed of newspaper clippings, arranged chronologically. Many of these clippings are of value, as, for example, Washington's letters describing the Battle of Monmouth published in *The Pennsylvania Packet*; others are curious, as advertisements relating to slaves, school announcements, the weather record, etc.

The opening article in the July number of *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* is "George Washington in Pennsylvania", the address delivered before the University of Pennsylvania on "University Day", by Governor Samuel W. Pennypacker. In "A great Philadelphian: Robert Morris", Dr. Oberholtzer states the importance of the financier's services, gives a brief sketch of his life, and, through extracts from his recently accessible writings, presents an entertaining picture of his personality. A second installment of letters from Jefferson to Charles



Wilson Peale, contributed by Horace W. Sellers covers the years 1805-1809. The thirty letters are chiefly concerned with Jefferson's attempts to secure a satisfactory "Polygraph" or writing machine.

The eighth volume of *Proceedings and Collections of the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society* (Wilkesbarre, 1904) contains two noteworthy historical contributions, "Count Zinzendorf and the Moravian and Indian Occupancy of the Wyoming Valley, 1742-1763", by Dr. F. C. Johnson, and "The Reminiscences of David Hayfield Conyngham, 1750-1834", edited by Rev. Horace E. Hayden.

"The Harmony Society. A Chapter in German American Culture History" is running in the *German American Annals*. The August number contains an account of the interesting industrial community of Economy, Pennsylvania, during the years 1825-1868.

The articles in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* for July cover a broad field, but there are several of historical interest. "Theodore Mommsen: His Place in Modern Scholarship", by William Kenneth Boyd, is an appreciative sketch of nine pages. In "Maryland in the Revolution", Dr. Bernard C. Steiner furnishes a eulogistic account of the way in which that state supplied its quota of men for the Revolutionary army. The article is evidently a by-product of his work as editor of the *Master Rolls*, in the Maryland Archives. W. G. Brown contributes a brief review of "Senator Hoar's Reminiscences". Dr. Walter L. Fleming has an unique article on "Industrial Development in Alabama During the Civil War", in which he gives an account of the "Military Industries", "Private Manufacturing Enterprises", "Salt-Making", etc. The expedients resorted to in order to obtain nitre for the manufacture of gunpowder remind one of stories of the Napoleonic wars.

The most interesting contribution in *Publications of the Southern History Association* for July is the "Journal of James Auld, 1765-1779". The document is rather fragmentary but contains an entertaining account of travels in Maryland and a good deal of genealogical material. The "Reconstruction Document" printed in this issue is a letter from Judge David Noggle to Senator J. R. Doolittle, May 30, 1862, discussing, among other matters, the emancipation of the slaves.

*The Domestic Slave Trade of the Southern States*, by Winfield H. Collins (Broadway Publishing Company, New York), is a brief treatment of the subject, with full references to the original and secondary material examined.

The Government Printing Office has recently put forth the second volume of Glenn Brown's *History of the United States Capitol*. It deals chiefly with the additions made to the capitol since 1850 and with the great improvement of the grounds under the late Frederick Law Olmstead, and includes an account of the works of painting and sculpture in the building and grounds, a list of all the innumerable appropriations made for the capitol by Congress, biographies of the architects, engineers



and superintendents employed, and a bibliography of the building. Thus is brought to a close a remarkable and authoritative work of no little interest. The first volume was issued in 1900.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* for July is composed wholly of continuations, with the exception of the "Census of Gloucester County, 1782-83", the first installment of which is communicated by Edward Wilson James.

*The Political History of Virginia during the Reconstruction Period*, by Hamilton James Eckenrode, is a recent addition to the "Johns Hopkins Studies".

The *William and Mary College Quarterly* for July prints a first installment of "Extracts from the Diary of Col. Landon Carter." Colonel Carter lived at "Sabine Hall" on the Rappahannock and left a very minute diary of his plantation life. The extracts in this number cover the year 1770. The other contributions to the *July Quarterly* are chiefly continuations.

Aside from continuations the July issue of *The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* contains a genealogical account, by Theodore D. Jervcy, of the Hayne family of South Carolina, in which is included a brief biographical sketch of Robert V. Hayne.

The Mississippi Department of Archives and History has just published the first *Official and Statistical Register* of that State. This *Register* is to be issued every four years; this first volume, an octavo of 700 pages, constitutes a useful and valuable manual of the history and government of Mississippi. Biographies of state and national officers are included as well as a summary of Mississippi history from De Soto to the present time.

Among the Louisiana exhibits at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition is *Louisiana Writers*, a list some sixty pages long, compiled by Thomas P. Thompson, of the writers, both "native and resident, including others, whose books belong to a bibliography of that State". The titles of the works of these writers are included.

Under the title *Documents relating to the Purchase and Exploration of Louisiana*, Houghton, Mifflin and Company have just brought out, in a handsome volume, two hitherto unpublished documents. The first of these, "The Limits and Bounds of Louisiana", by Thomas Jefferson, is of comparatively little value, but the second, the journal of an exploration of the Red, the Black, and the Washita Rivers, in 1804, by William Dunbar, is of considerable interest for the light it throws on the social conditions of the peoples encountered. The manuscript of this document was given to the American Philosophical Society in 1817. A map is included, as well as portraits of Jefferson and Dunbar, but most unfortunately the publishers saw fit to omit an index.

A *Brief History of the Louisiana Territory*, by Walter Robinson Smith (The St. Louis News Company, 1904) consists of four lectures

delivered before the Washington University Association on the Mary Hemenway Foundation. It is not based so much upon original sources as upon secondary material, but is a convenient summary of the history of the region included in the Louisiana Purchase, from the original discovery of the Mississippi by De Soto to the erection of the various states formed out of the territory acquired from Napoleon.

*The Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* for April contains the "Journal of the Permanent Council (October 11-27, 1835)" edited from "Records, Volume I., Archives of Texas", by Eugene C. Barker. The "Journal of Stephen F. Austin on His First Trip to Texas, 1821" presents an interesting picture of the country and conditions of life, and contains a good deal about Indians. "Concerning Philip Nolan", is a collection of letters by Thomas Jefferson, Daniel Clark, James Wilkinson and William Dunbar, from the archives of the Department of State, relative to this leader of this "first Anglo-American invasion of Texas". They are dated between 1798 and 1801.

Of most general interest in *The "Old Northwest" Genealogical Quarterly* for July is "Captain James Duncan's Diary of the Siege of Yorktown", contributed by W. F. Boogher of Washington. Captain Duncan was in Colonel Moses Hazen's regiment of Canadians, known as "Congress Own". He was an educated man and a good observer; the entries, some of which are very full are from October 2 to 15 inclusive.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has completed its series of indexes to its records, for 1849 to 1901. The last index, prepared by Mrs. Mary Elizabeth Haines, is to the *Proceedings* from 1874 to 1901.

The *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* for July contains four maps illustrative of the boundary history of Iowa, with historical comments by Benjamin F. Shambaugh. In the same number is "A Bibliography of Iowa State Publications for 1898 and 1899", by Margaret Budington. This is the second installment of what will become a complete bibliography, the publication for 1900 and 1901 having been listed in the *Journal* for July, 1904.

Among the contents of *Annals of Iowa* for July, we note: "The Louisiana Purchase in Correspondence of the Time", letters selected by Dr. William Salter, from printed material; "The Charge at Farmington", by Col. Charles C. Horton; and "Transplanting Iowa's Laws to Oregon", by Dr. Frank I. Herriott.

Mr. Reuben Gold Thwaites continues his series of "Early Western Travels" (Arthur H. Clark Company), with volume IV, *Cuming's Tour to the Western Country, 1807-1809*. Fortescue Cuming was an Englishman who had purchased land in Ohio, and who desired to look over his property. He went on foot from Philadelphia to Pittsburg, thence by boat on the Ohio to Maysville, and from there through Kentucky. Afterwards he went down the Mississippi as far as Bayou Pierre, and then visited West Florida. Mr. Thwaites says of his narrative "In

a plain, dispassionate style he has given us a picture of American life in the West . . . that for clear cut outlines and fidelity of presentation has the effect of a series of photographic representations . . . We miss entirely those evidences of assumed tolerance and superficial criticisms that characterize so many books of his day recounting travels in the United States". Volume V contains *Bradbury's Travels in the Interior of America, 1809-1811*. John Bradbury was commissioned by the Botanical Society of Liverpool to make researches into plant life in the United States. He arrived at St. Louis in 1809, made several excursions from there and then joined the overland Astorian expedition. Returning down the Missouri he went to New Orleans in charge of a boat laden with lead, and from there travelled somewhat in the southwest. The interest of Bradbury's account is chiefly for the region west of the Mississippi: he met Daniel Boone and John Colter, observed closely life among the Indians, Spanish influence, and other conditions. Volume VI contains *Brackenridge's Journal up the Missouri, 1811*, and *Franchère's Voyage to the Northwest Coast, 1811-1814*.

In two copiously illustrated volumes, bearing the title *The Trail of Lewis and Clark, 1804-1904* (Putnam's Sons), Mr. Olin D. Wheeler has brought together a great wealth of information regarding the history and route, as well as the personnel of this first great overland expedition. His opening chapter contains a survey of the Louisiana Purchase and its subsequent development; next comes an account of the origin and organization of the expedition, followed by sketches of the leaders in it, which contain much information relating to their later careers. A full narrative of the journey of the expedition compiled from the journals of Floyd and Gass as well as of Lewis and Clark, and interspersed with detailed discussions as to the location of disputed points, is included, as is also much supplementary archaeological and ethnological information.

In the *Boston Evening Transcript*, for September 7, is an account by R. W. Child of the great collection of books, documents and manuscripts left by the late Adolph Sutro, of San Francisco, which, since the death of its owner, intestate, has been involved, together with the rest of the property, in litigation, and hence wholly inaccessible. Among these treasures thus hidden for the last seven years is reported to be a very large collection of manuscripts and old chronicles from Mexico, which should be of great value for Mexican and California history, as well as for Aztec and Indian ethnology, and the doings of the Jesuits in the southwest.

We note a new edition of *Labor Evangelica de los Obreros de la Compañia de Jesus en las Islas Filipinas*, by Le P. Francisco Colin (three volumes, Paris, 1904).

A seventy-six page edition of the *Toronto Globe* was published on July 2, to celebrate the sixtieth anniversary of the paper's founding. Especial attention is given to the political, social, and economic development of the Dominion.

The Brazilian Legation at Washington has sent us *Brazil and Bolivia Boundary Settlement*; containing the treaty signed at Petropolis, November 17, 1903, the report of Baron Rio Branco, Minister for Foreign Relations of Brazil, and two large scale maps.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. G. Bradley, *The Fight for North America* (running in The Canadian Magazine); George F. Hoar, *Rufus Putnam* (Independent, July 7); Albert Perry Brigham, *The Geographic Importance of the Louisiana Purchase* (Journal of Geography, June); John Greenville McNeel, *American Prisoners at Dartmoor* (Harper's Magazine, September); A. T. Mahan, *The War of 1812* (Scribner's Magazine, July and September); Ulrich B. Phillips, *The Plantation as a Civilizing Factor* (Sewanee Review, July); *Washington in Wartime*, from the journal of Ralph Waldo Emerson (Atlantic, July); Louise W. Wright, *Memories of the Beginning and End of the Southern Confederacy* (McClure's Magazine, September); Grover Cleveland, *The American Government in the Chicago Strike of 1894* (Fortnightly Review, July); John Bassett Moore, *Freedom of the Seas* (Harper's Magazine, July); Brig. Gen. George B. Davis, Judge Advocate U. S. A., *International Law, its Past and Future* (Harper's Magazine, September); M. le marquis de Barral-Montferrat, *La Doctrine de Monroe*, concluded (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, July); Vize Admiral z. D. Valois, *Monroe-Doktrin und Weltfrieden* (Deutsche Revue, July); James Hannay, *The Settlement of Nova Scotia* (Canadian Magazine, August); D. Pedro Torres Lanzas, *Relación descriptiva de los Mapas Planos, etc., de las antiguas Audiencias de Panamá, Santa Fe y Quito, existentes en el Archivo General de Indias* (Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos, May).

